Probabilistic Epistemic Updates on Algebras

Willem Conradie[1], Sabine Frittella[2], Alessandra Palmigiano[1,3], Apostolos Tzimoulis[3], and Nachoem Wijnberg[4]

[1] Department of Pure and Applied Mathematics, University of Johannesburg
wconradie@uj.ac.za
[2] LIFO - Laboratoire d'Informatique Fondamentale d'Orlans
sabine.frittella@insa-cvl.fr
[3] Faculty of Technology, Policy and Management, Delft University of Technology
{a.palmigiano, a.tzimoulis-1}@tudelft.nl
[4] Faculteit Economie en Bedrijfskunde , Universiteit van Amsterdam
N.M.Wijnberg@uva.nl

arXiv:1612.05267v2 [math.LO] 6 Feb 2017

Abstract. The present paper contributes to the development of the mathematical theory of epistemic updates using the tools of duality theory. Here we focus on Probabilistic Dynamic Epistemic Logic (PDEL). We dually characterize the product update construction of PDEL-models as a certain construction transforming the complex algebras associated with the given model into the complex algebra associated with the updated model. Thanks to this construction, an interpretation of the language of PDEL can be defined on algebraic models based on Heyting algebras. This justifies our proposal for the axiomatization of the intuitionistic counterpart of PDEL, of which prove soundness and completeness with respect to algebraic probabilistic epistemic models.
Keywords: intuitionistic probabilistic dynamic epistemic logic, duality, intuitionistic modal logic, algebraic models, pointfree semantics.
Math. Subject Class.: 03B42, 06D20, 06D50, 06E15.

Acknowledgement: The research of the second to fourth author has been made possible by the NWO Vidi grant 016.138.314, by the NWO Aspasia grant 015.008.054, and by a Delft Technology Fellowship awarded in 2013.

Table of Contents

Probabilistic Epistemic Updates on Algebras 1
Willem Conradie, Sabine Frittella, Alessandra Palmigiano, Apostolos Tzimoulis, and Nachoem Wijnberg
1 Introduction 3
2 PDEL language and updates 4
2.1 PDEL-formulas, event structures, and PES-models 4
2.2 Epistemic updates 5
2.3 Semantics 7
2.4 Axiomatization 7
3 Methodology 9
4 Probabilistic dynamic epistemic updates on finite Heyting algebras 10
4.1 Epistemic Heyting algebras 10
4.2 Algebraic probabilistic epistemic structures 11
4.3 Probabilistic event structures over epistemic Heyting algebras 13
4.4 The intermediate (pre-)probabilistic epistemic structure 14
The intermediate algebra and its i-minimal elements. 14
The i-premeasures on the intermediate algebra. 16
The intermediate algebra for the classical case. 19
4.5 The pseudo-quotient and the updated APE-structure 20
5 Algebraic semantics of intuitionistic PDEL 25
6 Completeness 28
6.1 The epistemic Heyting algebra $\mathbb{A}^{\star}_{\varphi}$ 28
6.2 Measures on $\mathbb{A}^{\star}_{\varphi}$ 30
7 Relational semantics: a sneak preview 34
7.1 Informal presentation 34
7.2 Formalization: initial model and event structure 35
7.3 Updated model 37
7.4 Interpretation 38
8 Conclusions and further directions 39
A Soundness of the reduction axioms 41
A.1 Preliminary results. 41
A.2 Proof of the soundness. 44

1 Introduction

This paper pertains to a line of research aimed at exploring the notions of agency and information flow in situations in which truth is socially constructed. Such situations are ubiquitous in the real world. A prime example is the validity of contracts. Establishing that an agreement constitutes a valid contract involves appeals to notions such as legal competency, bona fide offers, etc. which are inherently socially constructed. The ultimate way in which the validity of a contract can be ascertained is for it to be tested in a court of law. In this last instance, the validity of a contract is thus procedural, and may also admit of situations in which it is indeterminate, such as when the court declares itself incompetent. These are features at odds with standard classical logic. Accommodating these features within classical logic requires encoding mechanisms. The alternative is working with logics which are specifically designed to accommodate these characteristics of socially constructed truth.
Examples of situations where truth is socially constructed are certainly not confined to contract law, but are easy to find in many other contexts. These include establishing public opinion in a binding way like referendums, establishing whether a certain item of clothing is fashionable, and determining the value of products in a market.
There is a large literature on logics which very adequately capture agency and information flow (see [VB11] and references therein), but assume a notion of truth that is classical. There is therefore a need for a uniform methodology for transferring these logics onto nonclassical bases. In [MPS14,KP13], a uniform methodology is introduced for defining the nonclassical counterparts of dynamic epistemic logics. This methodology, further pursued in [Riv14,BR15a,BvDF16], is grounded on semantics rather than on syntax, and is based on the dual characterizations of the transformations of models which interpret epistemic actions.
The present paper expands on the presentation of [CFPT15] and applies the methodology of [MPS14,KP13] to obtain nonclassical counterparts of probabilistic dynamic epistemic logic (PDEL) [Koo03], [vBGK09]. We will focus specifically on the intuitionistic environment as our case study. This environment allows for a finer-grained analysis when serving as a base for more expressive formalisms such as modal and dynamic logics. Indeed, the fact that the box-type and the diamond-type modalities are no longer interdefinable makes several mutually independent choices possible which cannot be disentangled in the classical setting. Moving to the intuitionistic environment also requires the use of intuitionistic probability theory (cf. [AGM08,FGM16]) as the background framework for probabilistic reasoning. From the point of view of applications this generalization is needed to account for situations in which the probability of a certain proposition p is interpreted as an agent's propensity to bet on p given some evidence for or against p. If there is little or no evidence for or against p, it should be reasonable to attribute low probability values to both p and $\neg p$, which is forbidden by classical probability theory (cf. [Wea03]).
Finally, these mathematical developments appear in tandem with interesting analyses on the philosophical side of formal logic (e.g. [AP14]), exploring epistemic logic in an evidentialist key, which is congenial to the kind of social situations targeted by our research programme.
Our methodology is based on the dual characterization of the product update construction for standard PDEL-models as a certain construction transforming the complex algebras associated with a given model into the complex algebra associated with the updated model. This dual characterization naturally generalizes to much wider classes of algebras, which include, but are not limited to, arbitrary BAOs and arbitrary modal expansions of Heyting algebras (HAOs). As an application of this dual characterization, we present the axiomatization for the intuitionistic analogue of PDEL which arises semantically from this construction and prove soundness and completeness for this axiomatization, with respect to the class of so called *algebraic probabilistic epistemic models* (cf. Definition 23).

Structure of the paper. In Section 2, we report on classical PDEL and its relational semantics. We give an alternative presentation of the product update construction which consists in two-steps, as done in [KP13]. The two-step construction highlights the elements which will be key in the dualization. In Section 3, we expand on the methodology underlying the application of the duality toolkit. Section 4 is the main section, in which the construction of the PDEL-updates on Heyting algebras is introduced. In Section 5, we define axiomatically the intuitionistic version of PDEL

and its interpretation on algebraic probabilistic epistemic models and we discuss the proof of its soundness. In Section 6, we prove the completeness of IPDEL with respect to algebraic probabilistic epistemic models. In Section 7, we discuss the case study of an art-investment decision. In Section 8 we collect conclusions and further directions. The details about the proof of soundness are collected in Appendix A.

2 PDEL language and updates

In the present section, we report on the language of PDEL, and give an alternative, two-step account of the product update construction on PDEL-models. This account is similar to the treatment of epistemic updates in [MPS14,KP13], and as explained in Section 3, it lays the ground to the dualization procedure which motivates the construction introduced in Section 4. The specific PDEL framework we report on shares common features with those of [BCHS13,Ach14] and [vBGK09].

2.1 PDEL-formulas, event structures, and PES-models

In this section, we first recall basic facts about probability distributions and probability measures, then we introduce the syntax and semantics of Probabilistic Dynamic Epistemic Logic (PDEL).

Remark 1. Given a finite set X, a probability distribution P over X is a map

$$P \ : \ X \to [0,1]$$

such that

$$\sum_{x\in X} P(x) = 1.$$

Recall that a probability measure on X can be defined as a map

$$\mu \ : \ \mathcal{P}X \to [0,1]$$

satisfying the following properties:

1. $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$,
2. $\mu(X) = 1$,
3. for any $A, B \subseteq X$, we have

$$\mu(A \cup B) = \mu(A) + \mu(B) - \mu(A \cap B).$$

The probability measure $\mu \ : \ \mathcal{P}X \to [0,1]$ determined by the probability distribution P over X is defined as follows: for any $S \subseteq X$,

$$\mu(S) := \sum_{x\in S} P(x).$$

In the remainder of the paper, we fix a countable set AtProp of proposition letters p, q and a set Ag of agents i. We let $\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_n, \beta$ denote rational numbers.

Definition 1 (PDEL syntax). *The set $\mathcal{L}$ of* PDEL-formulas *φ and the class $\mathsf{PEM}_{\mathcal{L}}$ of* probabilistic event structures *$\mathcal{E}$ over $\mathcal{L}$ are built by simultaneous recursion as follows:*

$$\varphi ::= p \mid \bot \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid \varphi \vee \varphi \mid \varphi \to \varphi \mid \Diamond_i \varphi \mid \Box_i \varphi \mid \langle \mathcal{E}, e\rangle \varphi \mid [\mathcal{E}, e]\varphi \mid (\sum_{k=1}^{n} \alpha_k \mu_i(\varphi)) \geq \beta,$$

where the event structures $\mathcal{E}$ are such as in Definition 4.
The connectives $\top$, $\neg$, and $\leftrightarrow$ are defined by the usual abbreviations.

Definition 2 (PES-model). *A* probabilistic epistemic state model (PES-model) *is a structure*

$$\mathbb{M} = (S, (\sim_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, (P_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, [\![\cdot]\!])$$

such that

- S *is a non-empty set,*
- *each* $\sim_i$ *is an equivalence relation on* S*,*
- *each* $P_i : S \to]0,1]$ *assigns a probability distribution on each* $\sim_i$*-equivalence class, (i.e.* $\sum\{P_i(s') : s' \sim_i s\} = 1$*), and*
- $[\![\cdot]\!] : \mathsf{AtProp} \to \mathcal{P}S$ *is a valuation map.*

As usual, the map $[\![\cdot]\!]$ will be identified with its unique extension to $\mathcal{L}$, so that we will be able to write $[\![\varphi]\!]$ for every $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$.

Remark 2. In the present treatment, the syntactic μ_is are intended to correspond to probability measures rather than probability distributions, as is more common in the literature. Indeed, usually, in the literature formulas talking about probabilities are defined by the following syntax $\alpha P_i(\varphi) \geq \beta$. But the P_i maps are probability distributions defined on the models (i.e. in the semantics), hence the notation $P_i(\varphi)$ is ambiguous and neglects the fact that we need to use a probability measure to talk about the probability over the extension of φ.

Definition 3 (Substitution function). *A* substitution function

$$\sigma \ : \ \mathsf{AtProp} \to \mathcal{L}$$

is a function that maps all but a finite number of proposition letters to themselves.
We will call the set

$$\{p \in \mathsf{AtProp} \mid \sigma(p) \neq p\}$$

the domain of σ *and denote it* $dom(\sigma)$*.*
Let $Sub_{\mathcal{L}}$ *denote the set of all substitution functions and* ϵ *the identity substitution.*

Definition 4 (Probabilistic event structure over a language). *A* probabilistic event structure over $\mathcal{L}$ *is a tuple*

$$\mathcal{E} = (E, (\sim_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, (P_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, \Phi, \mathsf{pre}, \mathbf{sub}),$$

such that

- E *is a non-empty finite set,*
- *each* $\sim_i$ *is an equivalence relation on* E*,*
- *each* $P_i : E \to]0,1]$ *assigns a probability distribution on each* $\sim_i$*-equivalence class, i.e.* $\sum\{P_i(e') : e' \sim_i e\} = 1$
- Φ *is a finite set of pairwise inconsistent* $\mathcal{L}$*-formulas, and*
- pre *assigns a probability distribution* $\mathsf{pre}(\bullet|\phi)$ *over* E *for every* $\phi \in \Phi$*.*
- $\mathbf{sub} : E \to Sub_{\mathcal{L}}$ *assigns a substitution function to each event in* E*.*

Informally, elements of E encode possible events, the relations $\sim_i$ encode as usual the epistemic uncertainty of the agent i, who assigns probability $P_i(e)$ to e being the actually occurring event, formulas in Φ are intended as the preconditions of the event, and $\mathsf{pre}(e|\phi)$ expresses the prior probability that the event $e \in E$ might occur in a(ny) state satisfying precondition ϕ. In addition, the substitution map $\mathbf{sub}(e)$ assigned to each event $e \in E$ describes how the event e changes the atomic facts of the world as represented by the proposition letters. In what follows, we will refer to the structures $\mathcal{E}$ defined above as *event structures over* $\mathcal{L}$.

Notation 1. *For any probabilistic epistemic model* $\mathbb{M}$*, any probabilistic event structure* $\mathcal{E}$*, any* $s \in S$ *and* $e \in E$*, we let* $\mathsf{pre}(e \mid s)$ *denote the value* $\mathsf{pre}(e \mid \phi)$*, for the unique* $\phi \in \Phi$ *such that* $\mathbb{M}, s \Vdash \phi$ *(recall that the formulas in* Φ *are pairwise inconsistent). If no such* ϕ *exists then we let* $\mathsf{pre}(e \mid s) = 0$*.*

2.2 Epistemic updates

In this subsection, we present an alternative and equivalent definition of the epistemic update on PES-models. With this approach, introduced in [MPS14,KP13], one performs the update in two steps instead of one like in the standard definition. These two steps are first to perform a coproduct, then to take a suboject. These steps are dualized as first product then quotient and this is

the advantage of the two-step presentation over the one-step one. Indeed product and quotient are constructions that one can uniformly apply to very different algebras such as boolean and Heyting algebras.

Throughout the present subsection, we fix a PES-model $\mathbb{M}$ and a probabilistic event structure $\mathcal{E}$ over $\mathcal{L}$. The updated model is given in two steps, the first of which is detailed in the following definition.

Definition 5 (Intermediate structure). *Let the* intermediate structure *of* $\mathbb{M}$ *and* $\mathcal{E}$ *be the tuple*

$$\coprod_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{M} := (\coprod_{|E|} S, (\sim_i^{\coprod})_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}}, (P_i^{\coprod})_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}}, [\![\cdot]\!]_{\coprod})$$

where

- $\coprod_{|E|} S \cong S \times E$ *is the* $|E|$*-fold coproduct of* S*,*
- *each binary relation* $\sim_i^{\coprod}$ *on* $\coprod_{|E|} S$ *is defined as follows:*

$$(s, e) \sim_i^{\coprod} (s', e') \quad \text{iff} \quad s \sim_i s' \text{ and } e \sim_i e',$$

- *each map* $P_i^{\coprod} : \coprod_{|E|} S \to [0, 1]$ *is defined by*

$$(s, e) \mapsto P_i(s) \cdot P_i(e) \cdot \mathsf{pre}(e \mid s),$$

- *and the valuation* $[\![\cdot]\!]_{\mathbb{M}} : \mathsf{AtProp} \to \mathcal{P}S$ *is defined by*

$$[\![p]\!]_{\coprod} := \{(s, e) \mid s \in [\![p]\!]_{\mathbb{M}}\} = [\![p]\!]_{\mathbb{M}} \times E$$

for every $p \in \mathsf{AtProp}$.

Remark 3. In general $P_i^{\coprod}$ does not induce probability distributions over the $\sim_i^{\coprod}$-equivalence classes. Hence, $\coprod_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{M}$ is not a PES-model.[5] However, the second step of the construction will yield a PES-model.

Finally, in order to define the updated model, observe that the map $\mathsf{pre} : E \times \Phi \to [0, 1]$ in $\mathcal{E}$ induces the map

$$\begin{aligned} pre : E &\to \mathcal{L} \\ e &\mapsto \bigvee \{\phi \in \Phi \mid \mathsf{pre}(e \mid \phi) \neq 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 6 (Updated model). *For any PES-model* $\mathbb{M}$ *and any probabilistic event structure* $\mathcal{E}$ *over* $\mathcal{L}$*, let the* epistemic update $\mathbb{M}^{\mathcal{E}}$ *of the model* $\mathbb{M}$ *by the probabilistic event structure* $\mathcal{E}$ *be as follows:*

$$\mathbb{M}^{\mathcal{E}} := (S^{\mathcal{E}}, (\sim_i^{\mathcal{E}})_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}}, (P_i^{\mathcal{E}})_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}}, [\![\cdot]\!]_{\mathbb{M}^{\mathcal{E}}})$$

with

1. $S^{\mathcal{E}} := \{(s, e) \in \coprod_{|E|} S \mid \mathbb{M}, s \Vdash pre(e \mid s)\}$*;*
2. *the map* $[\![\cdot]\!]_{\mathbb{M}^{\mathcal{E}}} : \mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{P}(S^{\mathcal{E}})$ *is defined as follows:*

$$[\![p]\!]_{\mathbb{M}^{\mathcal{E}}} := [\![sub(p)]\!]_{\coprod} \cap S^{\mathcal{E}}$$

where the map $sub(p)E \to \mathcal{L}$ *is given by:*

$$sub(p)(e) := \begin{cases} \mathbf{sub}(e)(p) & \text{if } p \in dom(\mathbf{sub}(e)) \\ p & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

3. $\sim_i^{\mathcal{E}} = \sim_i^{\coprod} \cap (S^{\mathcal{E}} \times S^{\mathcal{E}})$ *for any* $i \in \mathsf{Ag}$*;*

[5] Definition 13 will be introduced in Section 4 precisely with the purpose of capturing the dual of $P_i^{\coprod}$.

4. each map $P_i^{\mathcal{E}} : S^{\mathcal{E}} \to [0,1]$ *is defined by the assignment*

$$(s,e) \mapsto \frac{P_i^{\amalg}(s,e)}{\sum\{P_i^{\amalg}(s',e') \mid (s,e) \sim_i (s',e')\}}.$$

Lemma 1. *For any PES-model* $\mathbb{M}$ *and any probabilistic event structure* $\mathcal{E}$ *over* $\mathcal{L}$*, the* epistemic update $\mathbb{M}^{\mathcal{E}}$ *of the model* $\mathbb{M}$ *by the probabilistic event structure* $\mathcal{E}$ *is a PES-model.*

Proof. It is immediate that $\sim_i^{\mathcal{E}}$ is an equivalence relation. Since for every $s \in S$ $P_i(s) > 0$ it immediately follows that $P_i^{\mathcal{E}}(s,e) > 0$, and by construction it is a probability distribution over equivalence classes.

2.3 Semantics

In this subsection we provide the semantics of the logic PDEL over PES-models.

Definition 7 (Probability measure). *Given a PES-model*

$$\mathbb{M} = (S, (\sim_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, (P_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, [\![\cdot]\!]),$$

let the probability measure $\mu_i^{\mathbb{M}} : S \times \mathcal{L} \to [0,1]$ *be defined as follows: for any* $\phi \in \mathcal{L}$*,*

$$\mu_i^{\mathbb{M}}(s,\phi) \quad := \quad \sum_{\substack{s\sim_i s' \\ s'\in[\![\phi]\!]}} P_i(s').$$

Notice that μ_i *defines a probability measure on each* $\sim_i$*-equivalence class.*

Definition 8 (Semantics of PDEL). *Given a PES-model*

$$\mathbb{M} = (S, (\sim_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, (P_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, [\![\cdot]\!]),$$

and the probability measures $\mu_i^{\mathbb{M}}$ *defined as in definition 7, the formulas of the language* $\mathcal{L}$ *are interpreted as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{M}, s \models \bot \quad & \quad \textit{never} \\
\mathbb{M}, s \models p \quad & \textit{iff} \quad s \in [\![p]\!] \\
\mathbb{M}, s \models \phi \wedge \psi \quad & \textit{iff} \quad \mathbb{M}, s \models \phi \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathbb{M}, s \models \psi \\
\mathbb{M}, s \models \phi \vee \psi \quad & \textit{iff} \quad \mathbb{M}, s \models \phi \quad \textit{or} \quad \mathbb{M}, s \models \psi \\
\mathbb{M}, s \models \phi \to \psi \quad & \textit{iff} \quad \mathbb{M}, s \models \phi \quad \textit{implies} \quad \mathbb{M}, s \models \psi \\
\mathbb{M}, s \models \Diamond_i \phi \quad & \textit{iff} \quad \textit{there exists } s' \sim_i s \textit{ such that } \mathbb{M}, s' \models \phi \\
\mathbb{M}, s \models \Box_i \phi \quad & \textit{iff} \quad \mathbb{M}, s' \models \phi \quad \textit{for all } s' \sim_i s \\
\mathbb{M}, s \models \langle \mathcal{E}, e \rangle \phi \quad & \textit{iff} \quad \mathbb{M}, s \models \mathsf{pre}(e) \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathbb{M}^{\mathcal{E}}, (s,e) \models \phi \\
\mathbb{M}, s \models [\mathcal{E}, e] \phi \quad & \textit{iff} \quad \mathbb{M}, s \models \mathsf{pre}(e) \quad \textit{implies} \quad \mathbb{M}^{\mathcal{E}}, (s,e) \models \phi \\
\mathbb{M}, s \models (\sum_{k=1}^{n} \alpha_k \mu_i(\varphi)) \geq \beta \quad & \textit{iff} \quad \sum_{k=1}^{n} \alpha_k \mu_i^{\mathbb{M}}(\varphi)) \geq \beta
\end{aligned}$$

2.4 Axiomatization

PDEL is at the confluence between classical modal logic $S5$, dynamic epistemic logic, probability logic and real number logic. Hence its axiomatization describes the behaviour of each of these components as well as their interactions. The full axiomatization of PDEL is given in Table 1.

Lemma 2 (Soundness and Completeness). *PDEL is sound and complete w.r.t. the axiomatization given in Table 1.*

Proof. The statement follows from the general proof in Section 6 and Stone type duality.

Table 1. Axioms of PDEL

Axioms of classical modal logic S5	
	Tautologies of classical propositional logic
m1.	$\Box_i\varphi \to \varphi$
m2.	$\Box_i\varphi \to \Box_i\Box_i\varphi$
m3.	$\neg\Box\varphi \to \Box_i\neg\Box_i\varphi$
Axioms for inequalities	
n0.	$t \geq t$
n1.	$(t \geq \beta) \leftrightarrow (t + 0 \cdot \mu_i(\varphi) \geq \beta)$
n2.	$\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k \cdot \mu_i(\varphi_k) \geq \beta\right) \to \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_{\sigma(k)} \cdot \mu_i(\varphi_{\sigma(k)}) \geq \beta\right)$ for any permutation σ over $\{1, ..., n\}$
n3.	$\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k \cdot \mu_i(\varphi_k) \geq \beta\right) \wedge \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha'_k \cdot \mu_i(\varphi_k) \geq \beta'\right) \to \left(\sum_{k=1}^n (\alpha_k + \alpha'_k) \cdot \mu_i(\varphi_k) \geq (\beta + \beta')\right)$
n4.	$((t \geq \beta) \wedge (d \geq 0)) \to (d \cdot t \geq d \cdot \beta)$
n5.	$(t \geq \beta) \vee (\beta \geq t)$
n6.	$((t \geq \beta) \wedge (\beta \geq \gamma)) \to (t \geq \gamma)$
Axioms for classical probabilities	
p1.	$\mu_i(\bot) = 0$
p2.	$\mu_i(\top) = 1$
p3.	$(\varphi \to \psi) \to (\mu_i(\varphi) \leq \mu_i(\psi))$
p4.	$\Box_i\varphi \leftrightarrow (\mu_i(\varphi) = 1)$
p5.	$\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k \cdot \mu_i(\varphi_k) \geq \beta\right) \to \Box_i \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k \cdot \mu_i(\varphi_k) \geq \beta\right)$
Reduction Axioms	
i1.	$[\mathcal{E}, e]p \leftrightarrow \mathsf{pre}(e) \to \mathbf{sub}(e)(p)$
i2.	$[\mathcal{E}, e]\neg\varphi \leftrightarrow \mathsf{pre}(e) \to \neg[\mathcal{E}, e]\varphi$
i4.	$[\mathcal{E}, e](\varphi \wedge \psi) \leftrightarrow [\mathcal{E}, e]A \wedge [\mathcal{E}, e]B$
i5.	$[\mathcal{E}, e]\Box_i A \leftrightarrow Pre(e) \to \bigwedge\{\Box_i[\mathcal{E}, f]A \mid e \sim_i f\}$
i6.	$[\mathcal{E}, e]\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k \cdot \mu_i(\psi_k) \geq \beta\right) \leftrightarrow (\mathsf{pre}(e) \to C \geq D)$ with $C = \sum_{\phi\in\Phi} \sum_{e\sim_i f} \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k \cdot \mathsf{pre}(f \mid \phi) \cdot \mu_i(\phi \wedge [\mathcal{E}, f]\psi_k)$, $D = \sum_{\phi\in\Phi} \sum_{e\sim_i f} \beta \cdot \mathsf{pre}(f \mid \phi) \cdot \mu_i(\phi)$
Inference Rules	
MP.	if $\vdash A \to B$ and $\vdash A$, then $\vdash B$
Nec_i	if $\vdash A$, then $\vdash \Box_i A$
Nec_α	if $\vdash A$, then $\vdash [\mathcal{E}, e]A$
Sub_μ	if $\vdash A \to B$, then $\vdash \mu_i(A) \leq \mu_i(B)$

3 Methodology

In the present section, we expand on the methodology of the paper. In the previous section, we gave a two-step account of the *product update* construction which, for any PES-model $\mathbb{M}$ and any event model $\mathcal{E}$ over $\mathcal{L}$, yields the updated model $\mathbb{M}^{\mathcal{E}}$ as a certain *submodel* of a certain *intermediate model* $\coprod_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{M}$. This account is analogous to those given in [MPS14,KP13] of the product updates of models of PAL and Baltag-Moss-Solecki's dynamic epistemic logic EAK. In each instance, the original product update construction can be illustrated by the following diagram (which uses the notation introduced in the instance treated in the previous section):

$$\mathbb{M} \hookrightarrow \coprod_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{M} \hookleftarrow \mathbb{M}^{\mathcal{E}}.$$

As is well known (cf. e.g. [DP02]) in duality theory, coproducts can be dually characterized as products, and subobjects as quotients. In the light of this fact, the construction of *product update*, regarded as a "subobject after coproduct" concatenation, can be dually characterized on the algebras dual to the relational structures of PES-models by means of a "quotient after product" concatenation, as illustrated in the following diagram:

$$\mathbb{A} \twoheadleftarrow \prod_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{A} \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{A}^{\mathcal{E}},$$

resulting in the following two-step process. First, the coproduct $\coprod_{\mathcal{E}} M$ is dually characterized as a certain *product* $\prod_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{A}$, indexed as well by the states of $\mathcal{E}$, and such that $\mathbb{A}$ is the algebraic dual of $\mathbb{M}$; second, an appropriate *quotient* of $\prod_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{A}$ is then taken, which dually characterizes the submodel step. On which algebras are we going to apply the "quotient after product" construction? The prime candidates are the algebras associated with the PES-models via standard Stone-type duality:

Definition 9 (Complex algebra). *For any PES-model* $\mathbb{M} = (S, (\sim_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, (P_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, [\![\cdot]\!])$*, its complex algebra is the tuple*

$$\mathbb{M}^+ := \langle \mathcal{P}S, (\Diamond_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, (\Box_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, (P_i^+)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}} \rangle$$

where for each $i \in \mathsf{Ag}$ *and* $X \in \mathcal{P}S$*,*

$$\begin{aligned}
\Diamond_i X &= \{s \in S \mid \exists x\, (s \sim_i x \text{ and } x \in X)\},\\
\Box_i X &= \{s \in S \mid \forall x\, (s \sim_i x \implies x \in X)\},\\
\mathsf{dom}(P_i^+) &= \{X \in \mathcal{P}S \mid \exists y\, \forall x\, (x \in X \implies x \sim_i y)\},\\
P_i^+ X &= \sum_{x\in X} P_i(x).
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that the domain of P_i^+ *consists of all the subsets of the equivalence classes of* $\sim_i$*.*

In this setting, the "quotient after product" construction behaves exactly in the desired way, in the sense that one can check *a posteriori* that the following holds:[6]

Proposition 1. *For every PES-model* $\mathbb{M}$ *and any event structure* $\mathcal{E}$ *over* $\mathcal{L}$*, the algebraic structures* $(\mathbb{M}^+)^{\mathcal{E}}$ *and* $(\mathbb{M}^{\mathcal{E}})^+$ *can be identified.*

Proof. This results follows from: (1) Fact 12 in [KP13] that states that for any (non probabilistic) Kripke model the structures $(\mathbb{N}^+)^{\mathcal{E}}$ and $(\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{E}})^+$ can be identified, and (2) Lemma 7 on page 24 that states that the probability distributions on the PES-models $(\mathbb{M}^+)^{\mathcal{E}}$ and $(\mathbb{M}^{\mathcal{E}})^+$ are the same.

Moreover, the "quotient after product" construction holds in much greater generality than the class of complex algebras of PES-models, which is exactly its added value over the update on relational structures. In the following section, we are going to define it in detail in the setting of epistemic Heyting algebras.

[6] Caveat: we are abusing notation here. Proposition 1 should be formulated using Definition 19 and Fact 4.

4 Probabilistic dynamic epistemic updates on finite Heyting algebras

The present section aims at introducing the algebraic counterpart of the event update construction presented in Section 2. For the sake of enforcing a neat separation between syntax and semantics, throughout the present section, we will disregard the logical language $\mathcal{L}$, and work on *algebraic probabilistic epistemic structures* (APE-structures, cf. Definition 14) rather than on APE-models (i.e. APE-structures endowed with valuations). To be able to define the update construction, we will need to base our treatment on a modified definition of event structure over an algebra, rather than over $\mathcal{L}$.

4.1 Epistemic Heyting algebras

In the present subsection we start by introducing the algebraic structures on which the algebraic models will be based.

Definition 10 (Monadic Heyting algebra (cf. [Bez98])). *A monadic Heyting algebra is a tuple* $\mathbb{A} := \langle \mathbb{L}, (\Diamond_i)_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}}, (\Box_i)_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}}\rangle$ *such that* $\mathbb{L}$ *is a Heyting algebra, and each* $\Diamond_i$ *and* $\Box_i$ *is a monotone unary operation on* $\mathbb{L}$ *such that for all* $a, b \in \mathbb{L}$,

$$a \leq \Diamond_i a \tag{M1}$$
$$\Box_i a \leq a \tag{M2}$$
$$\Diamond_i(a \vee b) \leq \Diamond_i a \vee \Diamond_i b \tag{M3}$$
$$\Box_i(a \to b) \leq \Box_i a \to \Box_i b \tag{M4}$$
$$\Diamond_i a \leq \Box_i \Diamond_i a \tag{M5}$$
$$\Diamond_i \Box_i a \leq \Box_i a \tag{M6}$$
$$\Box_i(a \to b) \leq \Diamond_i a \to \Diamond_b \tag{M7}$$
$$\Diamond_i \bot \leq \bot \tag{M8}$$
$$\top \leq \Box_i \top \tag{M9}$$

Remark 4. The algebraic and duality theoretic treatment of monadic Heyting algebras has been developed in [Bez98] and [Bez99]. In particular, as mentioned in [Bez98, Lemma 2], in the presence of M9, axiom M4 is equivalent to $\Box_i a \wedge \Box_i b \leq \Box_i(a \wedge b)$, so all modalities are normal, and $\Diamond_i \Diamond_i a \leq \Diamond_i a$ and $\Box_i a \leq \Box_i \Box_i a$ are derivable from the axioms. These conditions correspond also in the best known intuitionistic settings to the transitivity of the associated accessibility relations (cf. [CP12]). This implies in particular that $\Diamond_i$ is a closure operator for each $i \in \mathsf{Ag}$.

The next definition intends to capture algebraically the notion of equivalence cell in the epistemic space of agents. Notice that for any equivalence relation R on a set X and any $x \in X$, the equivalence cell $R[x] = R^{-1}[x] = \langle R\rangle\{x\}$ is a minimal nonempty fixed point of $\langle R\rangle$. This justifies the following

Definition 11 (i-minimal elements). *An element* $a \in \mathbb{A}$ *is i-minimal if*

1. $a \neq \bot$,
2. $\Diamond_i a = a$ *and*
3. *if* $b \in \mathbb{A}$, $b < a$ *and* $\Diamond_i b = b$, *then* $b = \bot$.

Let $\mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A})$ *denote the set of the i-minimal elements of* $\mathbb{A}$.

Notice that for any $b \in \mathbb{A} \setminus \{\bot\}$ there exists at most one $a \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A})$ such that $b \leq a$. Indeed every such a must coincide with $\Diamond_i b$.

Definition 12 (Epistemic Heyting algebra). *An epistemic Heyting algebra is a finite* monadic Heyting algebra

$$\mathbb{A} := \langle \mathbb{L}, (\Diamond_i)_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}}, (\Box_i)_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}}\rangle$$

such that for every $i \in \mathsf{Ag}$ *and every* $a \in \mathbb{A}$ *the following holds:*

$$\Diamond_i a \vee \neg \Diamond_i a = \top \tag{E}$$

Notation 2. *In what follows,* $\mathbb{A}$ *will denote an epistemic Heyting algebra.*

Before moving on we present a basic fact about Epistemic Heyting Algebras.

Fact 3. *If* $\mathbb{A}$ *is an Epistemic Heyting algebra, then for any agent* i *we have that*

$$\Diamond_i\mathbb{A} := \{\Diamond_i a \in \mathbb{A} \mid a \in \mathbb{A}\}$$

is a Boolean sub-algebra of $\mathbb{A}$*. Furthermore, if*

$$\Box_i\mathbb{A} := \{\Box_i a \in \mathbb{A} \mid a \in \mathbb{A}\},$$

then $\Diamond_i\mathbb{A} = \Box_i\mathbb{A}$*.*

Proof. That $\Diamond_i\mathbb{A} = \Box_i\mathbb{A}$ follows immediately from axioms M5 and M6. That $\Diamond_i\mathbb{A}$ is an subalgebra of $\mathbb{A}$ follows from the fact the equalities

$$\Diamond_i(\Diamond_i a \wedge b) = \Diamond_i a \wedge \Diamond_i b$$

and

$$\Diamond_i(\Diamond_i a \to \Diamond_i b) = \Diamond_i a \to \Diamond_i b$$

hold in every monadic Heything algebra (see for example [Bez98, Lemma 2]). That $\Diamond_i\mathbb{A}$ is a Boolean algebra follows from axiom E: $\Diamond_i a \vee \neg\Diamond_i a = \top$.

Given the fact that Epistemic Heyting algebras are finite and since $\Diamond_i\mathbb{A}$ is a Boolean algebra it is not hard to see that i-minimal elements are the atoms of $\Diamond_i\mathbb{A}$ and hence $\bigvee \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A}) = \top$.

4.2 Algebraic probabilistic epistemic structures

In this section we endow epistemic Heyting algebras with a suitable counterpart of the probabilistic distribution. Out notion of probabilistic measure is intuitionistic and uses insights from [Wea03].

Definition 13 (i-premeasure & i-measure). *A partial function* $\mu : \mathbb{A} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ *is an* i-premeasure *on* $\mathbb{A}$ *if*

1. $\mathsf{dom}(\mu) = \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A})\downarrow$*;*
2. μ *is order-preserving;*
3. *for every* $a \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A})$ *and all* $b, c \in a\downarrow$ *it holds that* $\mu(b \vee c) = \mu(b) + \mu(c) - \mu(b \wedge c)$*;*
4. $\mu(\bot) = 0$ *if* $\mathsf{dom}(\mu) \neq \varnothing$*.*

An i*-premeasure on* $\mathbb{A}$ *is an* i-measure *if*

5. *for every* $a \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A})$ *and all* $b, c \in a\downarrow$ *such that* $b < c$ *it holds that* $\mu(b) < \mu(c)$*;*
6. $\mu(a) = 1$ *for every* $a \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A})$*.*

Definition 14 (ApPE-structure & APE-structure). *An* algebraic pre-probabilistic epistemic structure (ApPE-structure) *is a tuple*

$$\mathcal{F} := \langle \mathbb{A}, (\mu_i)_{i \in \mathsf{Ag}} \rangle$$

such that

1. $\mathbb{A}$ *is an epistemic Heyting algebra (cf. Definition 11), and*
2. *each* μ_i *is an* i*-premeasure on* $\mathbb{A}$*.*

An ApPE-structure $\mathcal{F}$ *is an* algebraic probabilistic epistemic structure (APE-structure) *if each* μ_i *is a* i*-measure on* $\mathbb{A}$*.*
We refer to $\mathbb{A}$ *as the* support *of* $\mathcal{F}$*.*

Lemma 3. *For any PES-model* $\mathbb{M}$*, the* i*-minimal elements of its complex algebra* $\mathbb{M}^+$ *are exactly the equivalence classes of* $\sim_i$*.*

Proof. Let

$$\mathbb{M} = \langle S, \mathsf{Ag}, (\sim_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, (P_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, \Psi, [\![\bullet]\!]\rangle$$

and its complex algebra

$$\mathbb{M}^+ = \langle \mathcal{P}S, (\Diamond_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, (\Box_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, (P_i^+)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}\rangle.$$

For any $s \in S$, let $[s]$ be the $\sim_i$-equivalence cell of s. Since $\sim_i$ is reflexive, $[s] \neq \varnothing$. Since $\sim_i$ is symmetric and transitive, $[s] = \Diamond_i\{s\} = \Diamond_i\Diamond_i\{s\} = \Diamond_i[s]$. This shows that $[s]$ is a fixed-point of $\Diamond_i$. Let $X \subseteq S$ be such that $X \subseteq [s]$, $X \neq \varnothing$ and $\Diamond_i X = X$. The assumption that $\Diamond_i X = X$ implies that $X = \bigcup_{x\in X}[x]$. The assumption that $X \subseteq [s]$ implies that all $x \in X$ must be $\sim_i$-equivalent to s, and hence to each other. Therefore, X cannot be the union of more than one equivalence cell. Moreover, the assumption that $X \neq \varnothing$ implies that there exists at least one equivalence cell in $\bigcup_{x\in X}[x]$. This concludes the proof that $X = [s]$, as required.
Let X be an i-minimal element of $\mathbb{M}^+$. The assumption that $X = \Diamond_i X$ implies that $X = \bigcup_{x\in X}[x]$. The assumption that $X \neq \varnothing$ implies that there exists at least one equivalence cell $[s]$ in $\bigcup_{x\in X}[x]$. By minimality, $X = [s]$.

Proposition 2. *For any PES-model $\mathbb{M}$, the complex algebra $\mathbb{M}^+$ (cf. Definition 9) is an APE-structure.*

Proof. Let $\mathbb{M} = \langle S, \mathsf{Ag}, (\sim_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, (P_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, \Psi, [\![\bullet]\!]\rangle$. Clearly, $\langle \mathcal{P}S, (\Diamond_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, (\Box_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}\rangle$ is an epistemic algebra, since $\sim_i$ is an equivalence relation and $\mathcal{P}S$ is a boolean algebra. Moreover, $P_i^+(\varnothing) = 0$, and since $P_i(s) \geq 0$ for all $s \in S$, the maps P_i^+ are monotone. To prove that $\mathbb{M}^+$ is an algebraic probabilistic epistemic structure, it remains to show that

(a) for every i-minimal element $X \in \mathcal{P}S$, we have $\mu_i(X) = 1$;
(b) for every i-minimal element $X \in \mathcal{P}S$ and all $Y_1, Y_2 \in X{\downarrow}$, we have

$$\mu_i(Y_1 \cup Y_2) = \mu_i(Y_1) + \mu_i(Y_2) - \mu_i(Y_1 \cap Y_2).$$

(c) for every i-minimal element $X \in \mathcal{P}S$ and all $Y_1 \subsetneq Y_2 \subseteq X$, we have that $P_i^+(Y_1) < P_i^+(Y_2)$.

`Proof of (a).` Let $X \in \mathcal{P}S$ be an i-minimal element. By Lemma 3, there exists an $s \in S$ such that $[s] = X$. Hence, using the definition of P_i (cf. Definition 9), we have:

$$P_i^+(X) = \sum_{x\in[s]} P_i(x) = 1,$$

as required.

`Proof of (b).` By Lemma 3, if X is an i-minimal element of $\mathbb{M}^+$, then $X = [s]$ for some $s \in S$. If $Y_1, Y_2 \subseteq [s]$ are as above, then $Y_1 \cup Y_2 \subseteq [s]$, hence for $1 \leq j \leq 2$ we have that $\sum_{x\in Y_j} P_i(x) \leq \sum_{x\in Y_1\cup Y_2} P_i(x) \leq \sum_{x\in[s]} P_i(x) = 1$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} P_i^+(Y_1 \cup Y_2) &= \sum_{x\in Y_1\cup Y_2} P_i(x) \\ &= \sum_{x\in Y_1\cup Y_2} P_i(x) \\ &= \sum_{x\in Y_1} P_i(x) + \sum_{x\in Y_2} P_i(x) - \sum_{x\in Y_1\cap Y_2} P_i(x) \\ &= P_i^+(Y_1) + P_i^+(Y_2) - P_i^+(Y_1 \cap Y_2). \end{aligned}$$

`Proof of (c).` By definition $P_i(s) > 0$ for every $s \in S$. Since $Y_1 \subsetneq Y_2$ it immediately follows that $P_i^+(Y_1) < P_i^+(Y_2)$.

4.3 Probabilistic event structures over epistemic Heyting algebras

We will find it useful to introduce the following auxiliary definition. For any set X, a *pre-ordered multiset* on X is a multiset Φ of elements of X such that for any $x \in X$ having multiplicity n in Φ, the copies $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ of x are endowed with an irreflexive linear order which we assume to be $x_1 \prec \cdots \prec x_n$. In what follows, we will use the membership symbol $\in$ in the context of multisets on X always referring to the copies of a given element on X. Hence, even when we abuse notation and write $y \in \Phi$, this symbol refers to some copy of the element $y \in X$.
Let us introduce probabilistic event strutures in the intuitionistic setting:

Definition 15 (Probabilistic event structure over an epistemic Heyting algebra). *For any epistemic Heyting algebra $\mathbb{A}$ (cf. Definition 12), a* probabilistic event structure over $\mathbb{A}$ *is a tuple*

$$\mathbb{E} = (E, (\sim_i)_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}}, (P_i)_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}}, \Phi, \mathsf{pre})$$

such that

1. *E, $\sim_i$, P_i are as in Definition 1;*
2. *Φ is a finite pre-ordered multiset on $\mathbb{A}$ such that, for all $a, b \in \Phi$ which arise from distinct elements in $\mathbb{A}$, either*

$$a \wedge b = \bot \quad \text{or} \quad a < b \quad \text{or} \quad b < a;$$

3. pre *assigns a probability distribution $\mathsf{pre}(\bullet|a)$ over E for every $a \in \Phi$;*
4. *for all $a \in \Phi$ and $e \in E$, if $\mathsf{pre}(e|a) = 0$ then $\mathsf{pre}(e|b) = 0$ for all $b \in \Phi$ such that $a < b$ (if a an b arise from distinct elements) or $a \prec b$ (if a and b are copies of the same element).*

The definition above is a proper generalization of the analogous definition given in the classical setting. The main generalization concerns the fact that the elements in Φ (which are the potential interpretants of formulas) are no longer required to be mutually inconsistent but may also be 'logically dependent'. In this latter case, the precondition function is required to satisfy an additional compatibility condition which is similar to the one adopted in [AGM08].
In what follows, we will typically refer to the structures defined above as *event structures*.

Remark 5. By comparing the definitions of *probabilistic event structures over a Kripke model* (see Definition 4) and *probabilistic event structure over an algebra* (see Definition 15) one can notice a difference: the substitution map is given only for probabilistic event structures over a Kripke model. Indeed, in this section, we define the update over algebras and not over algebraic models (see Section 5). Hence we cannot define the algebraic counterpart of the substitution map yet.

Remark 6. In *probabilistic event structures over a Kripke model* (see Definition 4) the set Φ contains mutually inconsistent formulas. This choice allows to define a partition of the states of Kripke model on which we do the update. However in the case of Heyting algebras we ask for the set Φ to satisfy the following conditions: for all $a_k, a_j \in \Phi$, either

$$a_j \wedge a_k = \bot \quad \text{or} \quad a_j < a_k \quad \text{or} \quad a_k < a_j.$$

Hence, if we consider the ordering relation given by $\rightarrow$, the set Φ is a forest. This emerged by studying intuitionistic Kripke models. Indeed, if we consider the intuitionistic Kripke model $\mathbb{M}$ (see Figure 1, page 13) where $\rightarrow$ represents the order relation, we can see that we cannot describe the partition $\{\{w_0\}, \{w_1\}\}$ with a set of inconsistent formulas. However if we consider $\Phi = \{\top, p\}$



Fig. 1. Intuitionistic Kripke model $\mathbb{M}$

Fig. 2. Haase diagram of the poset $(\Phi, \leq)$

enriched with the order ($\phi_1 \leq \phi_2$ iff $\phi_1 \rightarrow \phi_2$) on the set Φ (see Figure 2), we can define the partition as follows:

1. Notice that $p \to \top$.
2. Pick one of the smallest formulas w.r.t. $\to$ in the set Φ. In this example, we can only pick p.
3. $[\![p]\!] = \{w_1\}$ is one set of the partition.
4. If it exists, take the successor of p, i.e. consider the formula $\top$.
5. The new set in the partition is defined by $[\![\top]\!] \smallsetminus [\![p]\!]$ which is equal to $\{w_0\}$.

Remark 7. Another technical requirement concerns the fact that Φ is a pre-ordered multiset and not anymore a set. This requirement is intended to cater for situations where Φ arises from a set of formulas Ψ and different formulas in Ψ receive the same interpretation on the given model. In this case, the multiplicity of each member of Φ corresponds to how many formulas in Ψ are mapped to that member. Moreover the linear order on the various copies of the same member reflects the relation of logical entailment between the original formulas mapped to the same member.

4.4 The intermediate (pre-)probabilistic epistemic structure

In the present subsection, we define the intermediate ApPE-structure $\prod_{\mathbb{E}} \mathcal{F}$ associated with any APE-structure $\mathcal{F}$ and any event structure $\mathbb{E}$ over the support of $\mathcal{F}$ (cf. Definition 14 for the definition of support):

$$\prod_{\mathbb{E}} \mathcal{F} := \langle \prod_{|E|} \mathbb{A}, (\Diamond'_i)_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}}, (\Box'_i)_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}}, (\mu'_i)_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}} \rangle \tag{4.1}$$

Structure of the subsection. First, we define the intermediate algebra $\prod_{|E|} \mathbb{A}$ which will become the support of the intermediate ApPE-structure $\prod_{\mathbb{E}} \mathcal{F}$ (see Definition 16 and Proposition 3) and we identify its i-minimal elements (see Proposition 4). Then we introduce the i-premeasures on the intermediate algebra (see Definition 18 and Proposition 6). Finally, we show that the definition ApPE-structure is consistent with the relational semantics in the classical case (see Proposition 7).

The intermediate algebra and its i-minimal elements.

Definition 16 (Intermediate algebra). *For every epistemic Heyting algebra*

$$\mathbb{A} = (\mathbb{L}, (\Diamond_i)_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}}, (\Box_i)_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}})$$

and every event structure $\mathbb{E}$ *over* $\mathbb{A}$*, let* the intermediate algebra *be*

$$\prod_{\mathbb{E}} \mathbb{A} := (\prod_{|E|} \mathbb{L}, (\Diamond'_i)_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}}, (\Box'_i)_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}}),$$

where

1. $\prod_{|E|} \mathbb{L}$ *is the* $|E|$*-fold power of* $\mathbb{L}$*, the elements of which can be seen either as* $|E|$*-tuples of elements in* $\mathbb{A}$*, or as maps* $f : E \to \mathbb{A}$*;*
2. *for any* $f : E \to \mathbb{A}$*, let us define* $\Diamond'_i(f)$ *as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned} \Diamond'_i(f) : E &\to \mathbb{A} \\ e &\mapsto \bigvee \{\Diamond_i f(e') \mid e' \sim_i e\}; \end{aligned}$$

3. *for any* $f : E \to \mathbb{A}$*, let us define* $\Diamond'_i(f)$ *as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned} \Box'_i(f) : E &\to \mathbb{A} \\ e &\mapsto \bigwedge \{\Box_i f(e') \mid e' \sim_i e\}. \end{aligned}$$

Below, the algebra $\prod_{\mathbb{E}} \mathbb{A}$ *will be sometimes abbreviated as* $\mathbb{A}'$*.*

We refer to [KP13, Section 3.1] for an extensive justification of the definition of the operations $\Diamond'_i$ and $\Box'_i$.

Proposition 3. *For every epistemic Heyting algebra $\mathbb{A}$ and every event structure $\mathbb{E}$ over $\mathbb{A}$, the algebra $\mathbb{A}'$ is an epistemic Heyting algebra.*

Proof. The proof that $\mathbb{A}'$ is a Monadic Heyting algebra can be found in [KP13, Proposition 8]. It remains to be shown that $\Diamond'_i f \vee \neg\Diamond'_i f = \top$. Let $e \in E$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\Diamond'_i f \vee \neg\Diamond'_i f)(e) &= (\Diamond'_i f)(e) \vee \neg(\Diamond'_i f)(e) \\
&= \bigvee\{\Diamond_i(f(e')) \mid e' \sim e\} \vee \neg \bigvee\{\Diamond_i(f(e')) \mid e' \sim e\} && \text{(by definition)} \\
&= \Diamond_i \bigvee\{f(e') \mid e' \sim e\} \vee \neg\Diamond_i \bigvee\{f(e') \mid e' \sim e\} && \text{(by the normality of } \Diamond_i) \\
&= \top. && \text{(since } \Diamond_i a \vee \neg\Diamond_i a = \top)
\end{aligned}$$

That is we have that $(\Diamond'_i f \vee \neg\Diamond'_i f)(e) = \top$ for all $e \in E$, which by definition yields that $\Diamond'_i f \vee \neg\Diamond'_i f = \top$.

Proposition 4. *For every epistemic Heyting algebra $\mathbb{A}$ and every agent $i \in \mathsf{Ag}$,*

$$\mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A}') = \{f_{e,a} \mid e \in E \text{ and } a \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A})\},$$

where for any $e \in E$ and $a \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A})$, the map $f_{e,a}$ is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{e,a} : E &\to \mathbb{A} \\
e' &\mapsto \begin{cases} a & \text{if } e' \sim_i e \\ \bot & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let us first prove that any map $f_{e,a}$ as above is an i-minimal element of $\mathbb{A}'$. By definition, $f_{e,a}(e) = a \neq \bot^{\mathbb{A}}$. Hence $f_{e,a} \neq \bot^{\mathbb{A}'}$. As to showing that $\Diamond'_i f_{e,a} = f_{e,a}$, fix $e' \in E$, and let us show that $(\Diamond'_i f_{e,a})(e') = f_{e,a}(e')$. By definition,

$$\Diamond'_i f_{e,a}(e') = \bigvee\{\Diamond_i f_{e,a}(e'') \mid e'' \sim_i e'\}.$$

We proceed by cases: (a) If $e' \sim_i e$, then:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Diamond'_i f_{e,a}(e') &= \bigvee\{\Diamond_i f_{e,a}(e'') \mid e'' \sim_i e'\} && \text{(by definition)} \\
&= \bigvee\{\Diamond_i a \mid e'' \sim_i e'\} && (f_{e,a}(e'') = a, \text{ since } e \sim_i e' \text{ and } \sim_i \text{ symm \& transitive}) \\
&= \Diamond_i a && \text{(the join is nonempty since } \sim_i \text{ is reflexive)} \\
&= a && (a \text{ is } i\text{-minimal, hence is a fixed point of } \Diamond_i) \\
&= f_{e,a}(e'). && \text{(definition of } f_{e,a} \text{ and } e' \sim_i e)
\end{aligned}$$

(b) If $e' \nsim e$, then:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Diamond'_i f_{e,a}(e') &= \bigvee\{\Diamond_i f_{e,a}(e'') \mid e'' \sim_i e'\} && \text{(by definition)} \\
&= \bigvee\{\Diamond_i \bot \mid e'' \sim_i e'\} && (e \nsim_i e') \\
&= \Diamond_i \bot \\
&= \bot && (\Diamond_i \bot = \bot) \\
&= f_{e,a}(e').
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we need to show that $f_{e,a}$ is a minimal non bottom fixed point of $\Diamond'_i$. Notice preliminarily that if $g : E \to \mathbb{A}$ is a fixed point for $\Diamond'_i$ then

$$g(e) = g(e') \text{ whenever } e \sim_i e'. \tag{4.2}$$

Indeed,

$$g(e) = (\Diamond'_i g)(e) = \bigvee\{\Diamond_i g(e'') \mid e'' \sim_i e\} = \bigvee\{\Diamond_i g(e'') \mid e'' \sim_i e'\} = (\Diamond'_i g)(e') = g(e').$$

Given that $\sim_i$ is reflexive, this implies in particular that, for every $e' \in E$,

$$(\Diamond_i' g)(e') = \Diamond_i g(e'). \tag{4.3}$$

Let g be as above, assume that $\bot \neq g \leq f_{e,a}$, and let us show that $g = f_{e,a}$. Clearly, the assumption $g \leq f_{e,a}$ implies that $g(e') = \bot$ for every $e' \in E$ such that $e' \not\sim_i e$. Let $e' \in E$ such that $g(e') \neq \bot$. Together with the assumption that $g \leq f_{e,a}$, this implies that $f_{e,a}(e') \neq \bot$, hence $e' \sim_i e$ and $\bot \neq g(e') \leq a$. To prove that $g(e) = a$, by the i-minimality of a it suffices to show that $g(e')$ is a fixed point of $\Diamond_i$. Indeed, by (4.3):

$$\Diamond_i g(e') = (\Diamond_i' g)(e') = g(e'),$$

as required. Finally, the fact above and the preliminary observation (4.2) imply that $g(e') = a$ for every $e' \in E$ such that $e' \sim_i e$.
This finishes the proof that $f_{e,a}$ is i-minimal.

Conversely, let $g : E \to \mathbb{A}$ be i-minimal in $\mathbb{A}'$, and let us show that $g = f_{e,a}$ for some $e \in E$ and some i-minimal element $a \in \mathbb{A}$. The assumption that $g \neq \bot$ implies that $g(e) \neq \bot$ for some $e \in E$. Let $g(e) = a \in \mathbb{A}$. Then the assumption that $g = \Diamond_i' g$ and the observation (4.2) imply that $g(e') = a$ for every $e' \in E$ such that $e' \sim_i e$. Then the proof is finished if we show that a is i-minimal in $\mathbb{A}$. Indeed, then, by construction we would have $\bot \neq f_{e,a} \leq g$, hence the minimality of g would yield $f_{e,a} = g$.
By definition we have that $a = g(e') \neq \bot$. By observation (4.3),

$$\Diamond_i a = \Diamond_i g(e) = (\Diamond_i' g)(e) = g(e) = a,$$

which shows that a is a fixed point of $\Diamond_i$. Finally, let $\bot \neq b \leq a$ such that $\Diamond_i b = b$. Then, with an argument analogous to the one given above, the map $f_{e,b} : E \to \mathbb{A}$ would be proven to be a non-bottom fixed-point of $\Diamond_i'$. Moreover, $f_{e,b} \leq g$, and hence the i-minimality of g would yield $f_{e,b} = g$, hence $a = b$.

The i-premeasures on the intermediate algebra. Before defining i-premeasures for the product epistemic algebra (Definition 18 and Proposition 6), we present an auxiliary definition.

Definition 17. *Let $\mathcal{F} = \langle \mathbb{A}, (\mu_i)_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}}\rangle$ be an APE-structure and let $\mathbb{E} = (E, (\sim_i)_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}}, (P_i)_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}}, \Phi, \mathsf{pre})$ be an event structure over $\mathbb{A}$. For every $a \in \Phi$ and $i \in \mathsf{Ag}$ we define the partial function $\mu_i^a : \mathbb{A} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ by*

$$\mu_i^a(x) := \mu_i(x \wedge a) - \sum_{b\in \mathrm{mb}(a)} \mu_i(x \wedge b)$$

where $\mathrm{mb}(a)$ *denotes the set of the maximal elements of* $\Phi \cap (\downarrow a \smallsetminus \{a\})$ *for any* $a \in \Phi$.

We make the following observations regarding μ_i^a:

Proposition 5. *For every APE-structure $\mathcal{F} = \langle \mathbb{A}, (\mu_i)_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}}\rangle$ and every event structure $\mathbb{E}$ over $\mathbb{A}$, μ_i^a is an i-premeasure over $\mathbb{A}$. Furthermore, if $a \leq y$ then $\mu_i^a(x) = \mu_i^a(x \wedge y)$.*

Proof. For every $a \in \Phi$ and every $i \in \mathsf{Ag}$, we want to prove that μ_i^a is an i-premeasure over $\mathbb{A}$, hence we need to prove that μ_i^a is a partial function $\mathbb{A} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ that satisfies items (1 - 4) of Definition 13.

`Proof of item 1.` We want to prove that $\mathsf{dom}(\mu) = \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A})\downarrow$. The map μ_i is an i-premeasure, hence $\mathsf{dom}(\mu_i) = \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A})\downarrow$. Therefore the map μ_i^a is only defined on $\mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A})\downarrow$ and $\mathsf{dom}(\mu_i^a) = \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A})\downarrow$.

`Proof that` μ_i^a `is well-defined.` We need to prove that $\mu_i^a(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A})\downarrow$. Recall that Φ is a finite subset of $\mathbb{A}$ such that, for all $b, c \in \Phi$, either $b \wedge c = \bot$ or $b < c$ or $c < b$ (see Definition 15 and Remark 6). Hence, for every $b, c \in \mathrm{mb}(a)$ we have $b \wedge c = \bot$ or $b = c$.
Fix $x \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A})\downarrow$. Let us prove by induction on the size of S that for any set $S \subseteq \mathrm{mb}(a)$,

$$\mu_i\left(\bigvee_{b\in S} x \wedge b\right) = \sum_{b\in S} \mu_i(x \wedge b).$$

Assume that $S = \varnothing$. Then we trivially have that $\mu_i(\bigvee_{b\in S} x \wedge b) = \mu_i(\bot) = 0 = \sum_{b\in S} \mu_i(x \wedge b)$.

Assume that $\mu_i(\bigvee_{b'\in S'} x \wedge b') = \sum_{b'\in S'} \mu_i(x \wedge b')$ any set S' that contains exactly n elements. Let S contain exactly $n+1$ elements, $S' \subset S$ contain exactly n elements, and $S = S' \cup \{c\}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mu_i\left(\bigvee_{b\in S} x \wedge b\right) &= \mu_i\left((x \wedge c) \vee \bigvee_{b'\in S'} (x \wedge b')\right) \\
&= \mu_i(x \wedge c) + \mu_i\left(\bigvee_{b'\in S'} x \wedge b'\right) - \mu_i\left((x \wedge c) \wedge \bigvee_{b'\in S'} (x \wedge b')\right) \\
&\qquad\qquad (\mu_i \text{ is an } i\text{-premeasure}) \\
&= \mu_i(x \wedge c) + \mu_i\left(\bigvee_{b'\in S'} x \wedge b'\right) - \mu_i\left(\bigvee_{b'\in S'} x \wedge c \wedge x \wedge b'\right) \quad (\wedge \text{ distributes over } \vee) \\
&= \mu_i(x \wedge c) + \mu_i\left(\bigvee_{b'\in S'} x \wedge b'\right) - \mu_i(\bot) \qquad (c \wedge b' = \bot) \\
&= \mu_i(x \wedge c) + \sum_{b'\in S'} \mu_i(x \wedge b') \quad (\mu_i(\bot) = 0 \text{ and } \mu_i(\textstyle\bigvee_{b\in S'} x \wedge b) = \sum_{b\in S'} \mu_i(x \wedge b)) \\
&= \sum_{b\in S} \mu_i(x \wedge b) \qquad (S = S' \cup \{c\})
\end{aligned}
$$

This proves that for any $x \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A})\!\downarrow$,

$$
\mu_i\left(\bigvee_{b\in \mathrm{mb}(a)} x \wedge b\right) = \sum_{b\in \mathrm{mb}(a)} \mu_i(x \wedge b). \tag{4.4}
$$

Since $\mathrm{mb}(a)$ denotes the set of the maximal elements of $\Phi \cap {\downarrow}a$, we have that $\bigvee_{b\in \mathrm{mb}(a)} x \wedge b \leq x \wedge a$. Hence $\mu_i^a(x) \geq 0$ for any $x \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A})\!\downarrow$ as required.

`Proof of item 2.` We want to show that μ_i^a is order-preserving. Using (4.4) and the fact that $\wedge$ distributes over $\vee$, we get that: for any $x \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A})\!\downarrow$,

$$
\sum_{b\in \mathrm{mb}(a)} \mu_i\left(x \wedge b\right) = \mu_i\left(x \wedge \bigvee_{b\in \mathrm{mb}(a)} b\right). \tag{4.5}
$$

Fix $x, y \in v$ such that $x \leq y$. Notice that $\bigvee_{b\in \mathrm{mb}(a)} b \leq a$ and $x \wedge a \wedge y \wedge (\bigvee_{b\in \mathrm{mb}(a)} b) = x \wedge (\bigvee_{b\in \mathrm{mb}(a)} b)$. Furthermore, $x \wedge a \leq y \wedge a$ and $y \wedge (\bigvee_{b\in \mathrm{mb}(a)} b) \leq y \wedge a$. Hence $(x \wedge a) \vee (y \wedge$

$(\bigvee_{b\in \mathrm{mb}(a)} b)) \leq y \wedge a$. We can deduce that:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mu_i\left((x\wedge a)\vee\left(y\wedge \bigvee_{b\in \mathrm{mb}(a)} b\right)\right) \leq \mu_i(y\wedge a) && (\mu_i \text{ is order-preserving})\\
\Leftrightarrow\quad & \mu_i(x\wedge a)+\mu_i\left(y\wedge \bigvee_{b\in \mathrm{mb}(a)} b\right)-\mu_i\left(x\wedge a\wedge y\wedge \bigvee_{b\in \mathrm{mb}(a)} b\right)\leq \mu_i(y\wedge a) && (\mu_i \text{ is an } i\text{-premeasure})\\
\Leftrightarrow\quad & \mu_i(x\wedge a)+\mu_i\left(y\wedge \bigvee_{b\in \mathrm{mb}(a)} b\right)-\mu_i\left(x\wedge \bigvee_{b\in \mathrm{mb}(a)} b\right)\leq \mu_i(y\wedge a) && (\text{by } x\wedge a\wedge y\wedge (\textstyle\bigvee_{b\in \mathrm{mb}(a)} b) = x\wedge (\bigvee_{b\in \mathrm{mb}(a)} b))\\
\Leftrightarrow\quad & \mu_i(x\wedge a)-\mu_i\left(x\wedge \bigvee_{b\in \mathrm{mb}(a)} b\right)\leq \mu_i(y\wedge a)-\mu_i\left(y\wedge \bigvee_{b\in \mathrm{mb}(a)} b\right)\\
\Leftrightarrow\quad & \mu_i(x\wedge a)-\sum_{b\in \mathrm{mb}(a)}\mu_i(x\wedge b)\leq \mu_i(y\wedge a)-\sum_{b\in \mathrm{mb}(a)}\mu_i(y\wedge b) && (\text{by (4.5)})\\
\Leftrightarrow\quad & \mu_i^a(x)\leq \mu_i^a(y).
\end{aligned}$$

`Proof of item 3.` We need to show that $\mu_i^a(x\vee y)=\mu_i^a(x)+\mu_i^a(y)-\mu_i^a(x\wedge y)$ for all $x,y\in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A})\!\downarrow$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_i^a(x\vee y) &= \mu_i((x\vee y)\wedge a)-\sum_{b\in \mathrm{mb}(a)}\mu_i((x\vee y)\wedge b)\\
&= \mu_i((x\wedge a)\vee(y\wedge a))-\sum_{b\in \mathrm{mb}(a)}\mu_i((x\wedge b)\vee(y\wedge b)) && (\text{distributivity})\\
&= (\mu_i(x\wedge a)+\mu_i(y\wedge a)-\mu_i(x\wedge y\wedge a))-\sum_{b\in \mathrm{mb}(a)}(\mu_i(x\wedge b)+\mu_i(y\wedge b)-\mu_i(x\wedge y\wedge b)) && (\mu_i \text{ is an } i\text{-measure})\\
&= \mu_i^a(x)+\mu_i^a(y)-\mu_i^a(x\wedge y)
\end{aligned}$$

`Proof of item 4.` If $\mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A})\!\downarrow\neq\varnothing$, it follows from $\mu_i(\bot)=0$ (because μ_i is a i-premeasure) that $\mu_i^a(\bot)=0$.

Remark that if $a\leq y$, then for every $b\in \mathrm{mb}(a)$ we have $b\leq y$, thus $\mu_i(x\wedge y\wedge a)=\mu_i(x\wedge a)$ and $\mu_i(x\wedge y\wedge b)=\mu_i(x\wedge b)$, which implies that $\mu_i^a(x)=\mu_i^a(x\wedge y)$.

Definition 18 (Intermediate structure). *For any APE-structure $\mathcal{F}=\langle \mathbb{A},(\mu_i)_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}}\rangle$ and any event structure $\mathbb{E}=(E,(\sim_i)_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}},(P_i)_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}},\Phi,\mathsf{pre})$ over $\mathbb{A}$, let the* intermediate structure *be*

$$\prod_{\mathbb{E}}\mathcal{F} := \langle \prod_{\mathbb{E}}\mathbb{A},(\mu_i')_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}}\rangle$$

where

1. *$\prod_{\mathbb{E}}\mathbb{A}=\mathbb{A}'$ is defined as in Definition 16;*
2. *each μ_i' is defined as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_i' : \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A}')\!\downarrow &\to \mathbb{R}^+\\
f &\mapsto \sum_{e\in E}\sum_{a\in\Phi} P_i(e)\cdot \mu_i^a(f(e))\cdot \mathsf{pre}(e\mid a).
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 6. *For every APE-structure $\mathcal{F}$ and every event structure $\mathbb{E}$ over the support of $\mathcal{F}$, the intermediate structure $\prod_{\mathbb{E}} \mathcal{F}$ is an ApPE-structure (cf. Definition 14). Furthermore, if $\bigvee_{a\in\Phi} a \leq y$ then $\mu'_i(x) = \mu'_i(x \wedge y)$.*

Proof. Proposition 3 states that $\prod_{\mathbb{E}} \mathbb{A}$ is an epistemic Heyting algebra.To prove that $\prod_{\mathbb{E}} \mathcal{F}$ is an ApPE-structure, it remains to show that for every $i \in \mathsf{Ag}$, the map μ'_i is an i-premeasure (cf. items (1 - 4) of Definition 13). Fix $i \in \mathsf{Ag}$. The map μ'_i is clearly well-defined. Since the maps $\{\mu^a_i\}_{a\in\Phi}$ are i-premeasures, the items 1, 2, and 4 are trivially true.

`Proof of item 3.` By Proposition 4, i-minimal elements of $\mathbb{A}'$ are of the form $f_{e,a} : E \to \mathbb{A}$ for some $e \in E$ and some i-minimal element $a \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A})$. Fix one such element $f_{e,a} \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A}')$, and let $g, h : E \to \mathbb{A}$ such that $g, h \leq f_{e,a}$. By definition, $f \leq f_{e,a}$ can be rewritten as $f(e') \leq f_{e,a}(e')$ for any $e' \in E$. Since $f_{e,a}(e') = \bot$ for any $e' \nsim_i e$, we can deduce that $g(e') = h(e') = \bot$ for any $e' \nsim_i e$. Similarly, we can deduce that $g(e') \leq a$ and $h(e') \leq a$ for any $e' \sim_i e$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu'_i(g \vee h) &= \sum_{e'\in E}\sum_{a\in\Phi} P_i(e') \cdot \mu^a_i(g(e') \vee h(e')) \cdot \mathsf{pre}(e' \mid a) && \text{(by definition)}\\
&= \sum_{e\in E}\sum_{a\in\Phi} P_i(e) \cdot (\mu^a_i(g(e)) + \mu^a_i(h(e)) - \mu^a_i(g(e) \wedge h(e))) \cdot \mathsf{pre}(e \mid a)\\
&\qquad (\mu^a_i \text{ is an } i\text{-premeasure and } g(e) \leq a \text{ and } h(e) \leq a \text{ for any } e \in E)\\
&= \mu'_i(g) + \mu'_i(h) - \mu'_i(g \wedge h). && \text{(by definition)}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally the fact that if $\bigvee_{a\in\Phi} a \leq y$ then $\mu'_i(x) = \mu'_i(x \wedge y)$ follows from Proposition 5.

The intermediate algebra for the classical case. Our goal here is to prove the following Proposition 7, which shows that the constructions introduced above indeed capture algebraically the definition of intermediate structure defined in Section WHATEVER.

Definition 19. *For any PES-model $\mathbb{M} = (S, (\sim_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, (P_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, [\![\cdot]\!])$ (see Definition 2) and any probabilistic event structure $\mathcal{E} = (E, (\sim_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, (P_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, \Phi, \mathsf{pre})$ over $\mathcal{L}$ (see Definition 4), let the* probabilistic event structure over $\mathbb{M}^+$ *(see Definitions 9 and 15) be*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{E}} := (E, (\sim_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, (P_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, \Phi_{\mathbb{M}}, \mathsf{pre}_{\mathbb{M}}),$$

where

- $\Phi_{\mathbb{M}} := \{[\![\phi]\!]_{\mathbb{M}} \mid \phi \in \Phi\}$ *and*
- $\mathsf{pre}_{\mathbb{M}} : \Phi_{\mathbb{M}} \to (E \to [0,1])$ *assigns a probability distribution* $\mathsf{pre}(\bullet|a) : E \to [0,1]$ *over E for every $a \in \Phi_{\mathbb{M}}$.*

Henceforth, for any $\phi \in \Phi$, we will denote with μ^ϕ_i the i-premeasure $(P^+)^{[\![\phi]\!]}_i$.

Fact 4. *For any PES-model $\mathbb{M}$ (cf. Definition 2) and any event structure $\mathcal{E}$ over $\mathcal{L}$ (cf. Definition 4), the tuple $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{E}}$ is an event structure over the epistemic Heyting algebra underlying $\mathbb{M}^+$.*

Proposition 7. *For every PES-model $\mathbb{M}$ and any event structure $\mathcal{E}$ over $\mathcal{L}$,*

$$(\coprod_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{M})^+ \cong \prod_{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{E}}} \mathbb{M}^+.$$

Proof. The proof that the supports of the two APE-structures can be identified is essentially the same as that of [KP13, Fact 23.3], and is omitted. Recall that the basic identification between $\mathcal{P}(\coprod_{|E|} S)$ and $\prod_{|E|} \mathcal{P}(S)$ associates every subset $X \subseteq \coprod_{|E|} S$ with the map $g : E \to \mathcal{P}(S)$ defined by the assignment $e \mapsto X_e := \{s \in S \mid (s, e) \in X\}$. Let us prove that this identification induces an identification between the maps $\mu'_i : \prod_{|E|} \mathcal{P}(S) \to [0,1]$ and $(P^{\coprod}_i)^+ : \mathcal{P}(\coprod_{|E|} S) \to [0,1]$.[7]

[7] Refer to Definitions 5 and 9 for the definitions of the intermediate structure $\coprod_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{M}$ and of the complex algebra associated to a model.

In what follows we fix a subset $X \subseteq \coprod_{|E|} S$ in the domain of $P_i^{\amalg}$ and let $g \in \prod_{|E|} \mathcal{P}(S)$ be defined as its counterpart as discussed above. Recall that for any $s \in S$ and $e \in E$, $\mathsf{pre}(e \mid s)$ denotes the value $\mathsf{pre}(e \mid \phi)$ for the unique $\phi \in \Phi$ such that $\mathbb{M}, s \Vdash \phi$ (see Notation 1). Then we have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(P_i^{\amalg})^+(X) &= \sum_{(s,e)\in X} P_i^{\amalg}((s,e)) && \text{(Definition 9 on } P_i^{\amalg}) \\
&= \sum_{(s,e)\in X} P_i(s)\cdot P_i(e)\cdot \mathsf{pre}(e \mid s) && \text{(Definition 5)} \\
&= \sum_{e\in E}\sum_{s\in X_e} P_i(s)\cdot P_i(e)\cdot \mathsf{pre}(e \mid s) && (X_e := \{s \in S \mid (s,e)\in X\}) \\
&= \sum_{e\in E} P_i(e)\cdot \left(\sum_{s\in X_e} P_i(s)\cdot \mathsf{pre}(e \mid s)\right) \\
&= \sum_{e\in E} P_i(e)\cdot \sum_{\phi\in\Phi}\left(\sum_{s\in X_e\cap[\![\phi]\!]} P_i(s)\cdot \mathsf{pre}(e \mid s)\right) && (\Phi \text{ provides a partition of } S) \\
&= \sum_{e\in E} P_i(e)\cdot \left(\sum_{\phi\in\Phi}\left(\sum_{s\in X_e\cap[\![\phi]\!]} P_i(s)\right)\cdot \mathsf{pre}(e \mid \phi)\right) && \text{(Notation 1)} \\
&= \sum_{e\in E} P_i(e)\cdot \left(\sum_{\phi\in\Phi} P_i^+(X_e\cap[\![\phi]\!])\cdot \mathsf{pre}_{\mathbb{M}}(e \mid [\![\phi]\!])\right) && \text{(Definition 9)} \\
&= \sum_{e\in E} P_i(e)\cdot \left(\sum_{\phi\in\Phi} (P^+)_i^{[\![\phi]\!]}(X_e)\cdot \mathsf{pre}_{\mathbb{M}}(e \mid [\![\phi]\!])\right) \\
& && \text{(because } \mathrm{mb}([\![\phi]\!]) = \varnothing \text{ (Definition 17))} \\
&= \sum_{e\in E} P_i(e)\cdot \left(\sum_{\phi\in\Phi} \mu_i^{\phi}(X_e)\cdot \mathsf{pre}_{\mathbb{M}}(e \mid [\![\phi]\!])\right) && \text{(notation, see Definition 19)} \\
&= \sum_{e\in E}\sum_{\phi\in\Phi} P_i(e)\cdot \mu_i^{\phi}(X_e)\cdot \mathsf{pre}_{\mathbb{M}}(e \mid [\![\phi]\!]) \\
&= \sum_{e\in E}\sum_{\phi\in\Phi} P_i(e)\cdot \mu_i^{\phi}(g(e))\cdot \mathsf{pre}_{\mathbb{M}}(e \mid [\![\phi]\!]) \\
&= \mu_i'(g) && \text{(Definition 18 on } \mathbb{M}^+)
\end{aligned}
$$

4.5 The pseudo-quotient and the updated APE-structure

In the present subsection, we define the APE-structure $\mathcal{F}^{\mathbb{E}}$, resulting from the update of the APE-structure $\mathcal{F}$ with the event structure $\mathbb{E}$ over the support of $\mathcal{F}$, by taking a suitable pseudo-quotient of the intermediate APE-structure $\prod_{\mathbb{E}} \mathcal{F}$. Some of the results which are relevant for the ensuing treatment (such as the characterization of the i-minimal elements in the pseudo-quotient) are independent of the fact that we will be working with the intermediate algebra. Therefore, in what follows, we will discuss them in the more general setting of arbitrary epistemic Heyting algebras $\mathbb{A}$.

Structure of the subsection. First, we defined the pseudo-quotient algebra (Definition 20) and prove that it is an epistemic Heyting algebra (Proposition 8). Then we characterize the i-minimal elements of the pseudo-quotient algebra (Proposition 9). Finally, we define the the APE-structure $\mathcal{F}^{\mathbb{E}}$, resulting from the update of the APE-structure $\mathcal{F}$ with the event structure $\mathbb{E}$ (Definition 21 and Proposition 10) and show that this definition is compatible with the update on PES-models (Lemma 7).

Pseudo-quotient algebra.

Definition 20 (Pseudo-quotient algebra). *(cf. [MPS14, Sections 3.2, 3.3]) For any epistemic Heyting algebra* $\mathbb{A} := (\mathbb{L}, (\Diamond_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, (\Box_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}})$*, and any* $a \in \mathbb{A}$*, let the* pseudo-quotient algebra *be*

$$\mathbb{A}^a := (\mathbb{L}/\cong_a, (\Diamond_i^a)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, (\Box_i^a)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}),$$

where

- $\cong_a$ *is defined as follows: for all* $b, c \in \mathbb{L}$,

$$b \cong_a c \quad \textit{iff} \quad b \wedge a = c \wedge a,$$

- *for every* $i \in \mathsf{Ag}$ *the operations* $\Diamond_i^a$ *and* $\Box_i^a$ *are defined as follows:*

$$\Diamond_i^a : \mathbb{A}^a \to \mathbb{A}^a \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \Box_i^a : \mathbb{A}^a \to \mathbb{A}^a$$
$$b \mapsto [\Diamond_i(b \wedge a)] \qquad\qquad b \mapsto [\Box_i(a \to b)].$$

We denote $[c]$ *the* $\cong_a$*-equivalence class of any given* $c \in \mathbb{A}$*.*

Proposition 8. *(cf. [MPS14, Fact 12]) For any epistemic Heyting algebra* $\mathbb{A}$*, the pseudo-quotient algebra* $\mathbb{A}^a$ *(cf. Definition 20) is an epistemic Heyting algebra.*

Proof. The proof that $\mathbb{A}^a$ is a Monadic Heyting algebra can be found in [MPS14, Fact 12]. It remains to be shown that $\Diamond_i^a[b] \vee \neg\Diamond_i^a[b] = [\top]$. We have that $\Diamond_i^a[b] = [\Diamond_i(b \wedge a)]$ and that $\neg\Diamond_i^a[b] = \neg[\Diamond_i(b \wedge a)] = [\neg\Diamond_i(b \wedge a)]$. Hence

$$\Diamond_i^a[b] \vee \neg\Diamond_i^a[b] = [\Diamond_i(b \wedge a) \vee \neg\Diamond_i(b \wedge a)] = [\top],$$

as required.

The *i*-minimal elements of the pseudo-quotient algebra.

Lemma 4. *For any epistemic Heyting algebra* $\mathbb{A}$ *and any* $a \in \mathbb{A}$*, if* $b \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A})$ *and* $b \wedge a \neq \bot$*, then* $[b] \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A}^a)$*.*

Proof. Fix some $b \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A})$ such that $b \wedge a \neq \bot$. We need to prove that $[b] \in \mathbb{A}^a$ satisfies items 1, 2, and 3 of Definition 11. By assumption, $[b] \neq \bot$, hence $[b]$ satisfies item 1.
To show that $\Diamond_i^a[b] = [b]$ (item 2), it is enough to show that $\Diamond_i(b \wedge a) \wedge a = b \wedge a$. Clearly, $b \wedge a \leq b$ implies that $\Diamond_i(b \wedge a) \wedge a \leq \Diamond_i b \wedge a = b \wedge a$, making use that $\Diamond_i b = b$. Conversely, recalling that $\Diamond_i$ is reflexive (Definition 12, axiom (M1)), we have $b \wedge a = (b \wedge a) \wedge a \leq \Diamond_i(b \wedge a) \wedge a$. Hence, $\Diamond_i^a[b] = [b]$.
Finally, we need to prove that $[b]$ is a minimal fixed point of $\Diamond_i^a$ (item 3). let $[\bot] \neq [c] \leq [b]$ such that $\Diamond_i^a[c] = [c]$, and let us show that $[c] = [b]$. It is enough to show that $c \wedge a = b \wedge a$. The assumption that $[c] \leq [b]$ implies that $c \wedge a \leq b \wedge a \leq b$. Hence, $\Diamond_i(c \wedge a) \leq \Diamond_i b = b$. Notice that the assumption that $\Diamond_i$ is transitive (Definition 12, axiom (M6)) implies that $\Diamond_i\Diamond_i(c \wedge a) = \Diamond_i(c \wedge a)$, that is $\Diamond_i(c \wedge a)$ is a fixed point of $\Diamond_i$. Moreover, $\bot \neq c \wedge a \leq \Diamond_i(c \wedge a)$ implies that $\Diamond_i(c \wedge a) \neq \bot$. Hence, by the i-minimality of b, we conclude that $\Diamond_i(c \wedge a) = b$, and hence $\Diamond_i(c \wedge a) \wedge a = b \wedge a$. Moreover, the assumption that $\Diamond_i^a[c] = [c]$ implies that $\Diamond_i(c \wedge a) \wedge a = c \wedge a$. Thus, the following chain of identities holds $c \wedge a = \Diamond_i(c \wedge a) \wedge a = b \wedge a$ as required.

Lemma 5. *For any epistemic Heyting algebra* $\mathbb{A}$ *and any* $a \in \mathbb{A}$*, if* $[b] \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A}^a)$*, then* $\Diamond_i(b \wedge a)$ *is the unique i-minimal element of* $\mathbb{A}$ *which belongs to* $[b]$*.*

Proof. Let us first prove that $\Diamond_i(b \wedge a) \in [b]$. By assumption, $[b] \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A}^a)$, hence $[b] = \Diamond_i^a[b] = b \wedge a = \Diamond_i(b \wedge a) \wedge a$. This implies that $\Diamond_i(b \wedge a) \in [b]$.

Now we need to show that show that $\Diamond_i(b \wedge a)$ is an i-minimal element of $\mathbb{A}$. We need to prove that $\Diamond_i(b \wedge a)$ satisfies items 1, 2, and 3 of Definition 11.
By assumption, $[b] \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A}^a)$, hence $[b] \neq \bot$ and $b \wedge a \neq \bot$. Since $\Diamond_i$ is reflexive (Definition 12, axiom (M1)), $\bot \neq b \wedge a \leq \Diamond_i(b \wedge a)$, which shows that $\Diamond_i(b \wedge a) \neq \bot$ (item 1).
Moreover, since $\Diamond_i$ is transitive (Definition 12, axiom (M6)), $\Diamond_i(b \wedge a) = \Diamond_i\Diamond_i(b \wedge a)$ (item 2).

Finally, let $c \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A})$ and $c \leq \Diamond_i(b \wedge a)$. We will prove that $c = \Diamond_i(b \wedge a)$ (item 3). To do so, we first prove that $[b] = [c]$. From the assumptions that $c \leq \Diamond_i(b \wedge a)$ and that $[b] = \Diamond_i^a[b]$, we get that $c \wedge a \leq \Diamond_i(b \wedge a) \wedge a = b \wedge a$, which proves that $[c] \leq [b]$. Notice that $c \wedge a \neq \bot$. Indeed, since $c \leq \Diamond_i(b \wedge a)$ we have that $c \leq \Diamond_i a$, that is $c = c \wedge \Diamond_i a$. This gives the following chain of equalities:

$$c = c \wedge \Diamond_i a = \Diamond_i c \wedge \Diamond_i a = \Diamond_i(\Diamond_i c \wedge a).$$

The last equality is true in all Monadic Heyting algebras (see e.g. [Bez98, Definition 1]). Now since $\Diamond_i c = c$ we get that $c = \Diamond_i(c \wedge a)$, which implies $\Diamond_i(c \wedge a) \neq \bot$ and $c \wedge a \neq \bot$. By Lemma 4, $[c] \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A}^a)$. By the i-minimality of $[b]$, we get $[b] = [c]$, that is $b \wedge a = c \wedge a$. Hence $\Diamond_i(b \wedge a) = \Diamond_i(c \wedge a) \leq \Diamond_i(c) = c$, which, together with the assumption that $c \leq \Diamond_i(b \wedge a)$, proves that $\Diamond_i(b \wedge a) = c$, as required. This finishes the proof that $\Diamond_i(b \wedge a)$ is an i-minimal element of $\mathbb{A}$.

To show the uniqueness, let $c_1, c_2 \in [b]$ and assume that both c_1 and c_2 are i-minimal elements of $\mathbb{A}$. Then $c_1 \wedge a = c_2 \wedge a$, and hence $\Diamond_i(c_1 \wedge a) = \Diamond_i(c_2 \wedge a)$. Reasoning as above, one can show that $\bot \neq \Diamond_i(c_j \wedge a) \leq c_j$ and $\Diamond_i(c_j \wedge a)$ is a fixed point of $\Diamond_i$ for $1 \leq j \leq 2$. Hence, the i-minimality of c_j implies that $\Diamond_i(c_j \wedge a) = c_j$. Thus the following chain of identities holds:

$$c_1 = \Diamond_i(c_1 \wedge a) = \Diamond_i(c_2 \wedge a) = c_2.$$

Combining the two lemmas above, we obtain the following result.

Proposition 9. *The following are equivalent for any $\mathbb{A}$ and any $a \in \mathbb{A}$:*

1. $[b] \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A}^a)$;
2. $[b] = [b']$ *for a unique* $b' \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A})$ *such that* $b' \wedge a \neq \bot$.

Hence, in what follows, whenever $[b] \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A}^a)$, we will assume w.l.o.g. that $b \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A})$ is the "canonical" (in the sense of Proposition 9) representant of $[b]$.

The updated APE-structure. For any APE-structure $\mathcal{F}$ and any event structure $\mathbb{E}$ over the support $\mathbb{A}$ of $\mathcal{F}$, the map pre in $\mathbb{E}$ induces the map $\overline{\mathsf{pre}}$ defined as follows:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \overline{\mathsf{pre}} : E \to \mathbb{A} & & \\ e \mapsto & \bigvee\limits_{\substack{a \in \Phi \\ \mathsf{pre}(e|a) \neq 0}} a & \end{array} \tag{4.6}$$

It immediately follows from Propositions 4 and 9 that the i-minimal elements of $\mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{E}}$ are exactly the elements $[f_{e,a}]$ for $e \in E$ and $a \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A})$ such that $a \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}(e') \neq \bot$ for some $e' \sim_i e$.

Definition 21 (Updated APE-structure). *For any APE-structure $\mathcal{F}$ and any event structure $\mathbb{E}$ over the support of $\mathcal{F}$, the* updated APE-structure *is the tuple*

$$\mathcal{F}^{\mathbb{E}} := (\mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{E}}, (\mu_i^{\mathbb{E}})_{i \in \mathsf{Ag}})$$

such that:

1. $\mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{E}}$ *is obtained by instantiating Definition 20 to* $\prod_{\mathbb{E}} \mathbb{A}$ *and* $\overline{\mathsf{pre}} \in \prod_{\mathbb{E}} \mathbb{A}$, *i.e.*

$$\mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{E}} := (\prod_{\mathbb{E}} \mathbb{A})^{\overline{\mathsf{pre}}};$$

2. *The maps $\mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}$ are defined as follows:*

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mu_i^{\mathbb{E}} : \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{E}})\!\downarrow \to [0,1] & & \\ [g] \mapsto & \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } [g] = \bot, \\ \frac{\mu_i'(g)}{\mu_i'(f)} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} & \end{array}$$

where [f] is the only element in $\mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{E}})$ *such that* $[g] \leq [f]$.[8]

[8] see Definition 18 for the definition of the maps $(\mu_i')_{i \in \mathsf{Ag}}$

Lemma 6. *For any APE-structure $\mathcal{F}$ and any event structure $\mathbb{E}$ over the support of $\mathcal{F}$, the maps $(\mu_i^{\mathbb{E}})_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}$ of the updated APE-structure $\mathcal{F}^{\mathbb{E}} := (\mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{E}}, (\mu_i^{\mathbb{E}})_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}})$ are well-defined.*

Proof. If $[g] \neq \bot$ then $[f]$ is unique (cf. discussion after Definition 11). Moreover for each $g \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{E}})\!\downarrow$ such that $[g] \neq \bot$ we have $\mu_i'([g]) \neq 0$. Indeed let e be such that $g \wedge \overline{pre}(e) \neq \bot$. Since Φ is finite it is well founded with respect to the order. The set

$$\{a \in \Phi \quad | \quad \mu_i((g \wedge a)(e)) > 0 \text{ and } \mathsf{pre}(e|a) > 0\}$$

is non-empty hence it contains a minimal element. Let a_0 be such a minimal element. From Definition 15 we have that for all $b \in \Phi$ with $b < a_0$ it is the case that $\mathsf{pre}(e|b) > 0$. By the minimality of a_0 we have that $\mu_i((g \wedge b)(e)) = 0$ for all such $b < a_0$. Hence $\mu_i^{a_0}(g(e)) = \mu_i((g \wedge a_0)(e))$ and therefore $\mu_i^{a_0}(g(e)) > 0$. Hence $P_i(e) \cdot \mu_i^{a_0}(g(e)) \cdot \mathsf{pre}(e|a_0) > 0$. This guarantees that $\mu_i'([g]) \neq 0$. From the above it follows that the division $\frac{\mu_i'(g)}{\mu_i'(f)}$ is defined. Finally $\mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}$ assigns exactly one value to $[g]$ because for every $g_1, g_2 \in [g]$, $\mu_i'(g_1) = \mu_i'(g_1 \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}) = \mu_i'(g_2 \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}) = \mu_i'(g_2)$ (see Proposition 6). Hence $\mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}$ is well-defined for any $i \in \mathsf{Ag}$.

Proposition 10. *For any APE-structure $\mathcal{F}$ and any event structure $\mathbb{E}$ over the support of $\mathcal{F}$, the tuple $\mathcal{F}^{\mathbb{E}} = (\mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{E}}, (\mu_i^{\mathbb{E}})_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}})$ is an APE-structure.*

Proof. To prove that $\mathcal{F}^{\mathbb{E}}$ is an APE-structure (cf. Definition 14) we need to prove that $\mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{E}}$ is an epistemic Heyting algebra (cf. Definition 11), and that each map $\mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}$ is an i-measure on $\mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{E}}$. By Proposition 8, $\mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{E}}$ is an epistemic Heyting algebra. Hence it remains to prove that for each $i \in \mathsf{Ag}$ the map $\mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}$ is an i-measure (see Definition 13), i.e. we need to prove that:

1. $\mathsf{dom}(\mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}) = \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{E}})\!\downarrow$;
2. $\mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}$ is order-preserving;
3. for every $a \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{E}})$ and all $b, c \in a\!\downarrow$ it holds that $\mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}(b \vee c) = \mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}(b) + \mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}(c) - \mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}(b \wedge c)$;
4. $\mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}(\bot) = 0$ if $\mathsf{dom}(\mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}) \neq \varnothing$;
5. for every $a \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{E}})$ and all $b, c \in a\!\downarrow$ such that $b < c$ it holds that $\mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}(b) < \mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}(c)$.
6. $\mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}(a) = 1$ for every $a \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{E}})$.

Let us assume that the domain of $\mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}$ is non-empty. Clearly, $\mathsf{dom}(\mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}) = \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{E}})\!\downarrow$ (item 1), $\mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}(\bot) = 0$ (item 4) and $\mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}([f]) = 1$ for all $[f] \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{E}})$ (item 6).
To argue that $\mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}$ is monotone (item 2), observe preliminarily that $\mu_i'(g) = \mu_i'(g \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}})$. This follows by the definition of μ_i' (see Definition 18), Proposition 5 and the fact that if $\mathsf{pre}(e \mid a) \neq 0$ then $a \leq \overline{\mathsf{pre}}(e)$ (cf. Definition of $\overline{\mathsf{pre}}$ (4.6)). Assume that $[g_1] \leq [g_2] \leq [f_{e,a}]$. This means that $g_1 \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}} \leq g_2 \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}$. Since μ_i' is monotone, $\mu_i'(g_1) = \mu_i'(g_1 \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}) \leq \mu_i'(g_2 \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}) = \mu_i(g_2)$. This implies that

$$\frac{\mu_i'(g_1)}{\mu_i'(f_{e,a})} \leq \frac{\mu_i'(g_2)}{\mu_i'(f_{e,a})}$$

that is, $\mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}([g_1]) \leq \mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}([g_2])$.
For item 5, notice first that, as proven in Lemma 6 if $[g] \neq \bot$ then $\mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}([g]) > 0$. Now let $\bot \neq [g] < [h]$. Monotonicity guarantees that for all e and $a \in \Phi$ it is the case that

$$P_i(e) \cdot \mu_i^a(g(e)) \cdot \mathsf{pre}(e|a) \leq P_i(e) \cdot \mu_i^a(h(e)) \cdot \mathsf{pre}(e|a).$$

Furthermore, since $[g] < [h]$, there exists an $e \in E$ such that the set

$$\{a \in \Phi \quad | \quad \mathsf{pre}(e|a) > 0 \text{ and } g(e) \wedge a < h(e) \wedge a\}$$

is non-empty. Since Φ is finite the order is well founded and the aforementioned set contains a minimal element. Let a_0 be such a minimal element. From Definition 15 we have that for all $b \in \Phi$ with $b < a_0$ it is the case that $\mathsf{pre}(e|b) > 0$. By the minimality of a_0 we have that $g(e) \wedge b = h(e) \wedge b$ for all such $b < a_0$. By the definition of $\mu_i^{a_0}$ it immediately follows that $\mu_i^{a_0}(g(e)) < \mu_i^{a_0}(h(e))$. Hence for some $e \in E$ and $a \in \Phi$ we have

$$P_i(e) \cdot \mu_i^a(g(e)) \cdot \mathsf{pre}(e|a) < P_i(e) \cdot \mu_i^a(h(e)) \cdot \mathsf{pre}(e|a).$$

From the above it follows that $\mu_i'([g]) < \mu_i'([h])$, which in turn implies that $\mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}([g]) < \mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}([h])$.

As for the item 3, let $[g_1]$ and $[g_2]$ in $\mathcal{F}^{\mathbb{E}}$ such that $[g_1] \leq [f_{e,a}]$ and $[g_2] \leq [f_{e,a}]$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}([g_1] \vee [g_2]) &= \frac{\mu_i'((g_1 \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}) \vee (g_2 \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}))}{\mu_i'(f_{e,a})} \\
&= \frac{\mu_i'(g_1 \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}) + \mu_i'(g_2 \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}) - \mu_i'((g_1 \wedge g_2) \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}})}{\mu_i'(f_{e,a})} \\
&\qquad\qquad (\mu_i' \text{ is an } i\text{-premeasure, see Proposition 6}) \\
&= \frac{\mu_i'(g_1 \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}})}{\mu_i'(f_{e,a})} + \frac{\mu_i'(g_2 \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}})}{\mu_i'(f_{e,a})} - \frac{\mu_i'((g_1 \wedge g_2) \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}})}{\mu_i'(f_{e,a})} \\
&= \frac{\mu_i'(g_1)}{\mu_i'(f_{e,a})} + \frac{\mu_i'(g_2)}{\mu_i'(f_{e,a})} - \frac{\mu_i'(g_1 \wedge g_2)}{\mu_i'(f_{e,a})} \\
&= \mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}([g_1]) + \mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}([g_2]) - \mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}([g_1 \wedge g_2]).
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 7. *For any PES-model $\mathbb{M}$ and any event structure $\mathcal{E}$ over $\mathcal{L}$,*

$$(P_i^+)^{\mathbb{E}\varepsilon} \cong (P_i^{\mathcal{E}})^+.$$

Proof. Using Definitions 6 and 9, we get that: for all $X \in \mathsf{Min}_i((\mathbb{M}^{\mathcal{E}})^+)\downarrow$,

$$(P_i^{\mathcal{E}})^+(X) = \sum_{(s,e)\in X} \frac{P_i(e) \cdot P_i(s) \cdot \mathsf{pre}(e \mid s)}{\sum_{(s',e')\sim_i(s,e)} P_i(e') \cdot P_i(s') \cdot \mathsf{pre}(e' \mid s')}.$$

By using Definitions 9 and 21, we get that: for any $[g] \in \mathsf{Min}_i((\mathbb{M}^+)^{\mathbb{E}})\downarrow$,

$$(P_i^+)^{\mathbb{E}\varepsilon}([g]) = \frac{\sum_{e\in E}\sum_{\phi\in\Phi} P_i(e) \cdot \mu_i^{[\![\phi]\!]}(g(e)) \cdot \mathsf{pre}(e \mid [\![\phi]\!])}{\sum_{e\in E}\sum_{\phi\in\Phi} P_i(e) \cdot \mu_i^{[\![\phi]\!]}(f(e)) \cdot \mathsf{pre}(e \mid [\![\phi]\!])}.$$

For any $X \in \mathsf{Min}_i((\mathbb{M}^{\mathcal{E}})^+)\downarrow$ and $e \in E$, let $X_e := \{s \in S \mid (s,e) \in X\}$. Let $[g] \in \mathsf{Min}_i((\mathbb{M}^+)^{\mathbb{E}})\downarrow$ be the map such that $g(e) = X_e$ for every $e \in E$. Notice that X is a subset of one of the i-equivalence classes of $(\mathbb{M}^{\mathcal{E}})^+$, hence $g = g \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}$ and $[g] \leq [f]$ for some $[f] \in \mathsf{Min}_i((\mathbb{M}^+)^{\mathbb{E}})\downarrow$. Let $[X]_i$ be $\{(s,e) \mid \exists (s',e') \in X,\ (s,e) \sim_i (s',e')\}$. We can easily see that $([X]_i)_e = f(e)$ where f is the canonical representative of $[f]$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
(P_i^{\mathcal{E}})^+(X) &= \sum_{(s,e)\in X} \frac{P_i(e) \cdot P_i(s) \cdot \mathsf{pre}(e \mid s)}{\sum_{(s',e')\sim_i(s,e)} P_i(e') \cdot P_i(s') \cdot \mathsf{pre}(e' \mid s')} \\
&= \frac{\sum_{(s,e)\in X} P_i(e) \cdot P_i(s) \cdot \mathsf{pre}(e \mid s)}{\sum_{(s',e')\in[X]_i} P_i(e') \cdot P_i(s') \cdot \mathsf{pre}(e' \mid s')} \\
&\qquad\qquad (X \text{ is a subset of the equivalence classes } [X]_i) \\
&= \frac{\sum_{e\in E} P_i(e) \cdot \sum_{s\in X_e} P_i(s) \cdot \mathsf{pre}(e \mid s)}{\sum_{e'\in E} P_i(e') \cdot \sum_{s'\in f(e')} P_i(s') \cdot \mathsf{pre}(e' \mid s')} \qquad (([X]_i)_e = f(e)) \\
&= \frac{\sum_{e\in E} P_i(e) \cdot \sum_{\phi\in\Phi} \mathsf{pre}(e \mid \phi) \cdot \sum_{s\in g(e)\cap[\![\phi]\!]} P_i(s)}{\sum_{e'\in E} P_i(e') \cdot \sum_{\phi\in\Phi} \mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi) \cdot \sum_{s'\in f(e')\cap[\![\phi]\!]} P_i(s')} \\
&\qquad\qquad (\text{In the classical case, } \Phi \text{ gives a partition of } S^{\mathcal{E}}) \\
&= \frac{\sum_{e\in E} P_i(e) \cdot \sum_{\phi\in\Phi} \mathsf{pre}(e \mid \phi) \cdot \mu_i(g(e) \cap [\![\varphi]\!])}{\sum_{e'\in E} P_i(e') \cdot \sum_{\phi\in\Phi} \mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi) \cdot \mu_i(f(e) \cap [\![\varphi]\!])} \\
&= \frac{\sum_{e\in E} P_i(e) \cdot \sum_{\phi\in\Phi} \mathsf{pre}(e \mid \phi) \cdot \mu_i^{[\![\varphi]\!]}(g(e))}{\sum_{e'\in E} P_i(e') \cdot \sum_{\phi\in\Phi} \mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi) \cdot \mu_i^{[\![\varphi]\!]}(f(e))} \\
&\qquad\qquad (\text{cf. Definition 17 and the order on } \Phi \text{ is the identity relation}) \\
&= \frac{\sum_{e\in E}\sum_{\phi\in\Phi} P_i(e) \cdot \mu_i^{[\![\phi]\!]}(g(e)) \cdot \mathsf{pre}(e \mid [\![\phi]\!])}{\sum_{e\in E}\sum_{\phi\in\Phi} P_i(e) \cdot \mu_i^{[\![\phi]\!]}(f(e)) \cdot \mathsf{pre}(e \mid [\![\phi]\!])} \\
&= (P_i^+)^{\mathbb{E}\varepsilon}([g]).
\end{aligned}$$

5 Algebraic semantics of intuitionistic PDEL

In the present section, we apply the update construction on algebras introduced in the previous section to the definition of the intuitionistic counterpart of PDEL.

Syntax. The set $\mathcal{L}$ of *IPDEL-formulas* φ and the class $\mathsf{IPEM}_{\mathcal{L}}$ of *intuitionistic probabilistic event structures* $\mathbb{E}$ over $\mathcal{L}$ are built by simultaneous recursion as follows:

$$\varphi ::= p \mid \bot \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid \varphi \vee \varphi \mid \varphi \to \varphi \mid \Diamond_i \varphi \mid \Box_i \varphi \mid \langle \mathcal{E}, e \rangle \varphi \mid [\mathcal{E}, e] \varphi \mid (\sum_{k=1}^{n} \alpha_k \mu_i(\varphi)) \geq \beta,$$

where the event structures $\mathcal{E}$ are such as in Definition 22.
The connectives $\top$, $\neg$, and $\leftrightarrow$ are defined by the usual abbreviations. The formulas of the form $(\sum_{k=1}^{n} \alpha_k \mu_i(\varphi)) \geq \beta$ and their negations will be henceforth called *i-probability formulas.*

Definition 22 (Intuitionistic probabilistic event structure). *A* intuitionistic probabilistic event structure over $\mathcal{L}$ *is a tuple*

$$\mathcal{E} = (E, (\sim_i)_{i \in \mathsf{Ag}}, (P_i)_{i \in \mathsf{Ag}}, \Phi, \mathsf{pre}, \mathbf{sub}),$$

such that

- E *is a non-empty finite set,*
- *each* $\sim_i$ *is an equivalence relation on* E*,*
- *each* $P_i : E \to]0, 1]$ *assigns a probability distribution on each* $\sim_i$*-equivalence class (i.e.,* $\sum\{P_i(e') : e' \sim_i e\} = 1$*),*
- Φ *is a finite set of formulas in* $\mathcal{L}$ *such that, for all* $\phi_k, \phi_j \in \Phi$*, either they contradict each other or* $\vdash \phi_k \to \phi_j$ *or* $\vdash \phi_j \to \phi_k$
- pre *assigns a probability distribution* $\mathsf{pre}(\bullet|\phi)$ *over* E *for every* $\phi \in \Phi$*;*
- $\mathbf{sub} : E \to Sub_{\mathcal{L}}$ *assigns a substitution function to each event in* E*.*

Semantics.

Definition 23 (APE-models). Algebraic probabilistic epistemic models (APE-models) *are tuples* $\mathcal{M} = \langle \mathcal{F}, v \rangle$ *s.t.* $\mathcal{F} = \langle \mathbb{A}, (\mu_i)_{i \in \mathsf{Ag}} \rangle$ *is an APE-structure, and* $v : \mathsf{AtProp} \to \mathbb{A}$*.*

The update construction of Section 4 extends from APE-structures to APE-models. Indeed, for any APE-model $\mathcal{M}$ and any event structure

$$\mathcal{E} = (E, (\sim_i)_{i \in \mathsf{Ag}}, (P_i)_{i \in \mathsf{Ag}}, \Phi, \mathsf{pre}, \mathbf{sub}),$$

over $\mathcal{L}$ (cf. Definition 22), the following tuple is an event structure over $\mathbb{A}$:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{E}} := (E, (\sim_i)_{i \in \mathsf{Ag}}, (P_i)_{i \in \mathsf{Ag}}, \Phi_{\mathcal{M}}, \mathsf{pre}_{\mathcal{M}}),$$

where $\Phi_{\mathcal{M}}$ is the preordered multiset over $\mathbb{A}$ the elements of which are $[\![\phi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \in \mathbb{A}$ for each $\phi \in \Phi$. The multiplicity of $[\![\phi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}$ is the cardinality of $\{\psi \in \Phi \mid [\![\psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} = [\![\phi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}\}$ and for every distinct $\phi, \psi \in \Phi$, $[\![\phi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} < [\![\psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}$ if and only if $\vdash \phi \to \psi$.[9] Finally, $\mathsf{pre}_{\mathcal{M}}$ assigns a probability distribution $\mathsf{pre}(\bullet|a)$ over E for every $a \in \Phi_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Definition 24 (Updated model). *The update of the APE-model* $\mathcal{M} = \langle \mathcal{F}, v \rangle$ *by the intuitionistic probabilistic event structure* $\mathcal{E} = (E, (\sim_i)_{i \in \mathsf{Ag}}, (P_i)_{i \in \mathsf{Ag}}, \Phi, \mathsf{pre}, \mathbf{sub})$ *is given by the APE-model*

$$\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{E}} := \langle \mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{E}}, v^{\mathcal{E}} \rangle,$$

where

- $\mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{E}} := \mathcal{F}^{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{E}}}$ *as in Definition 21,*

[9] Caveat: the definition of $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{E}}$ should more appropriately be given by simultaneous induction together with the interpretation of formulas.

– *and the map* $v^{\mathcal{E}}$ *is defined as follows:*

$$v^{\mathcal{E}} : \mathsf{AtProp} \to \mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{E}\varepsilon}$$
$$p \mapsto \begin{cases} [v^{\Pi}(\mathbf{sub}(e)(p))] & \text{if } p \in dom(\mathbf{sub}(e)) \\ [v^{\Pi}(p)] & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where

$$v^{\Pi}(p) : E \to \prod_{\mathbb{E}\varepsilon} \mathbb{A} \qquad \text{and} \qquad v^{\Pi}(\mathbf{sub}(e)(p)) : E \to \prod_{\mathbb{E}\varepsilon} \mathbb{A}$$
$$e \mapsto v(p) \qquad\qquad e \mapsto v(\mathbf{sub}(e)(p))$$

Notation 5. *We define the* e*th projection* π_e *for every* $e \in E$*, the quotient map* π *and the map* ι *as follows:*

$$\pi_e : \prod_{\mathbb{E}\varepsilon} \mathbb{A} \to \mathbb{A} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \pi : \prod_{\mathbb{E}\varepsilon} \mathbb{A} \to \mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{E}\varepsilon} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \pi : \prod_{\mathbb{E}\varepsilon} \mathbb{A} \to \mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{E}\varepsilon}$$
$$g \mapsto g(e) \qquad\qquad g \mapsto [g] \qquad\qquad [g] \mapsto g \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}.$$

As explained in [MPS14, Section 3.2], the map ι *is well defined.*

Definition 25 (Semantics). *The interpretation of* $\mathcal{L}$*-formulas on any APE-model* $\mathcal{M}$ *is defined recursively as follows:*

$$\begin{array}{rlrl}
[\![p]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= v(p) & [\![\varphi \to \psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= [\![\varphi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \to^{\mathbb{A}} [\![\psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \\
[\![\bot]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= \bot^{\mathbb{A}} & [\![\top]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= \top^{\mathbb{A}} \\
[\![\varphi \wedge \psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= [\![\varphi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \wedge^{\mathbb{A}} [\![\psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} & [\![\varphi \vee \psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= [\![\varphi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \vee^{\mathbb{A}} [\![\psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \\
[\![\Diamond_i \varphi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= \Diamond_i [\![\varphi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} & [\![\Box_i \varphi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= \Box_i [\![\varphi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \\
[\![\langle \mathcal{E}, e \rangle \varphi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= [\![\overline{\mathsf{pre}}(e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \wedge^{\mathbb{A}} \pi_e \circ \iota([\![\varphi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{E}\varepsilon}}) & [\![[\mathcal{E}, e]\varphi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= [\![\overline{\mathsf{pre}}(e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \to^{\mathbb{A}} \pi_e \circ \iota([\![\varphi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{E}\varepsilon}}) \\
[\![(\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k \mu_i(\varphi_k)) \geq \beta]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= \bigvee \{ a \in \mathbb{A} \mid a \in \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A}) \text{ and } (\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k \mu_i([\![\varphi_k]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \wedge a)) \geq \beta \}
\end{array}$$

Axioms. PDEL is at the confluence between classical modal logic $S5$, dynamic epistemic logic, probability logic and real number logic. Hence its axiomatization describes the behaviour of each of these components as well as their interactions. The full axiomatization of PDEL is given in Table 2 (see page 27).
Notice that in the axiomatization for the classical logic in Table 1 axiom p4 is different from the axiom P4 in Table 2. The following lemma motivates this change.

Lemma 8. *Axiom P4 in Table 2 implies axiom p4 in Table 1. In classical logic the two formulas are equivalent in the context of the rest of the axioms.*

Proof. That P4 implies p4 follows immediately by replacing ψ with $\top$. The reasoning below shows that p4 implies P4 in classical logic.

$$\begin{array}{lr}
\Box_i(\psi \leftrightarrow \phi) \leftrightarrow \mu_i(\psi \leftrightarrow \phi) = 1 & \text{(Axiom p4)} \\
\leftrightarrow \mu_i((\neg\psi \vee \phi) \wedge (\neg\phi \vee \psi)) = 1 & \text{(classical logic equivalence)} \\
\to (\mu_i((\neg\psi \vee \phi) = 1) \wedge (\mu_i(\neg\phi \vee \psi)) = 1) & \text{(Rule } Sub_\mu\text{)} \\
\to (\mu_i(\neg(\neg\psi \vee \phi)) = 0) \wedge (\mu_i(\neg\phi \vee \psi)) = 1) & (\mu_i(\sigma) = 1 - \mu_i(\neg\sigma) \text{ in PDEL}) \\
\to (\mu_i(\psi \wedge \neg\phi)) = 0) \wedge (\mu_i(\neg\phi \vee \psi)) = 1) & \text{(De Morgan laws)} \\
\to (\mu_i(\psi \wedge \neg\phi)) = 0) \wedge (\mu_i(\neg\phi) + \mu_i(\psi) - \mu_i(\psi \wedge \neg\phi) = 1) & \text{(Axiom P3)} \\
\to (\mu_i(\neg\phi) + \mu_i(\psi) = 1) & \\
\to (\mu_i(\neg\phi) + \mu_i(\psi) = \mu_i(\phi) + \mu_i(\neg\phi)) & (\mu_i(\sigma) = 1 - \mu_i(\neg\sigma) \text{ in PDEL}) \\
\to \mu_i(\psi) = \mu_i(\phi) &
\end{array}$$

For the other direction we have:

Table 2. Axioms of IPDEL

Axioms of IPL			
H1.	$A \to (B \to A)$	H2.	$(A \to (B \to C)) \to ((A \to B) \to (A \to C))$
H3.	$A \to (B \to A \wedge B)$	H4.	$(A \to C) \to ((B \to C) \to (A \vee B \to C))$
H5.	$A \wedge B \to A$	H6.	$A \wedge B \to B$
H7.	$A \to A \vee B$	H8.	$B \to A \vee B$
H9.	$\bot \to A$		
Axioms for static modalities			
M1.	$p \to \Diamond_i p$	M2.	$\Box_i p \to p$
M3.	$\Diamond_i(p \vee q) \to \Diamond_i p \vee \Diamond_i q$	M4.	$\Box_i(p \to q) \to \Box_i p \to \Box_i q$
M5.	$\Diamond_i p \to \Box_i \Diamond_i p$	M6.	$\Diamond_i \Box_i p \to \Box_i p$
M7.	$\Box_i(p \to q) \to (\Diamond_i p \to \Diamond_i q)$	E.	$\Diamond_i p \vee \neg \Diamond_i p$
Axioms for inequalities			
N0.	$t \geq t$		
N1.	$(t \geq \beta) \leftrightarrow (t + 0 \cdot \mu_i(\varphi) \geq \beta)$		
N2.	$\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k \cdot \mu_i(\varphi_k) \geq \beta\right) \to \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_{\sigma(k)} \cdot \mu_i(\varphi_{\sigma(k)}) \geq \beta\right)$ for any permutation σ over $\{1, ..., n\}$		
N3.	$\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k \cdot \mu_i(\varphi_k) \geq \beta\right) \wedge \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha'_k \cdot \mu_i(\varphi_k) \geq \beta'\right) \to \left(\sum_{k=1}^n (\alpha_k + \alpha'_k) \cdot \mu_i(\varphi_k) \geq (\beta + \beta')\right)$		
N4.	$((t \geq \beta) \wedge (d \geq 0)) \to (d \cdot t \geq d \cdot \beta)$		
N5.	$(t \geq \beta) \vee (\beta \geq t)$		
N6.	$(t \geq \beta) \to (t > \gamma)$ for all $\gamma < \beta$		
Axioms for Intuitionistic Probabilities			
P1.	$\mu_i(\bot) = 0$		
P2.	$\mu_i(\top) = 1$		
P3.	$\mu_i(\varphi) + \mu_i(\psi) = \mu_i(\varphi \vee \psi) + \mu_i(\varphi \wedge \psi)$		
P4.	$[(\Box_i(\phi \to \psi)) \wedge (\mu_i(\phi) = \mu_i(\psi))] \leftrightarrow \Box_i(\psi \leftrightarrow \phi)$		
P5.	$\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k \cdot \mu_i(\varphi_k) \geq \beta\right) \to \Box_i \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k \cdot \mu_i(\varphi_k) \geq \beta\right)$		
Reduction Axioms			
I1.	$[\mathbb{E}, e]\, p \leftrightarrow \mathsf{pre}(e) \to \mathbf{sub}(e, p)$	I2.	$\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle p \leftrightarrow \mathsf{pre}(e) \wedge \mathbf{sub}(e, p)$
I3.	$[\mathbb{E}, e]\, \top \leftrightarrow \top$	I4.	$\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle \top \leftrightarrow \mathsf{pre}(e)$
I5.	$[\mathbb{E}, e]\, \bot \leftrightarrow \neg \mathsf{pre}(e)$	I6.	$\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle \bot \leftrightarrow \bot$
I7.	$[\mathbb{E}, e]\, (\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2) \leftrightarrow [\mathbb{E}, e]\, \psi_1 \wedge [\mathbb{E}, e]\, \psi_2$	I8.	$\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle (\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2) \leftrightarrow \langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle \psi_1 \wedge \langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle \psi_2$
I9.	$[\mathbb{E}, e]\, (\psi_1 \vee \psi_2) \leftrightarrow \mathsf{pre}(e) \to \langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle \psi_1 \vee \langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle \psi_2$	I10.	$\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle (\psi_1 \vee \psi_2) \leftrightarrow \langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle \psi_1 \vee \langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle \psi_2$
I11.	$[\mathbb{E}, e]\, (\psi_1 \to \psi_2) \leftrightarrow \langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle \psi_1 \to \langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle \psi_2$	I12.	$\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle (\psi_1 \to \psi_2) \leftrightarrow \mathsf{pre}(e) \wedge (\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle \psi_1 \to \langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle \psi_2)$
I13.	$[\mathbb{E}, e]\, \Diamond_i \psi \leftrightarrow \mathsf{pre}(e) \to \bigvee_{e' \sim_i e} \Diamond_i (\langle \mathbb{E}, e'\rangle \psi)$	I14.	$\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle \Diamond_i \psi \leftrightarrow \mathsf{pre}(e) \wedge \bigvee_{e' \sim_i e} \Diamond_i (\langle \mathbb{E}, e'\rangle \psi)$
I15.	$[\mathbb{E}, e]\, \Box_i \psi \leftrightarrow \mathsf{pre}(e) \to \bigwedge_{e' \sim_i e} \Box_i ([\mathbb{E}, e']\psi)$	I16.	$\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle \Box_i \psi \leftrightarrow \mathsf{pre}(e) \wedge \bigwedge_{e' \sim_i e} \Box_i ([\mathbb{E}, e']\psi)$
I17.	$[\mathbb{E}, e]\, (\alpha \mu_i(\psi) \geq \beta) \leftrightarrow \mathsf{pre}(e) \to (C + D \geq 0)$	I18.	$\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle (\alpha \mu_i(\psi) \geq \beta) \leftrightarrow \mathsf{pre}(e) \wedge (C + D \geq 0)$
	where $C := \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i e \\ \phi \in \Phi}} \alpha P_i(e') \mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi) \mu_i^\phi([\mathbb{E}, e']\, \psi)$ and $D := \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i e \\ \phi \in \Phi}} -\beta P_i(e') \mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi) \mu_i^\phi(\top)$, with $\mu_i^\phi(\psi) := \mu_i(\psi \wedge \phi) - \sum_{\sigma \in \mathrm{mb}(\phi)} \mu_i(\psi \wedge \sigma)$ and $\mathrm{mb}(\phi) := \max_{\to} \Phi \cap {\downarrow}\phi$.		
Inference Rules			
MP.	if $\vdash A \to B$ and $\vdash A$, then $\vdash B$		
Nec_i	if $\vdash A$, then $\vdash \Box_i A$		
Nec_α	if $\vdash A$, then $\vdash [\mathcal{E}, e]A$		
Sub_μ	if $\vdash A \to B$, then $\vdash \mu_i(A) \leq \mu_i(B)$		
SubEq	if $\vdash A \leftrightarrow B$, then $\vdash \phi \leftrightarrow \phi[A/B]$		

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Box_i(\phi \to \psi) \wedge (\mu_i(\phi) = \mu_i(\psi)) &\to (\mu_i(\neg\phi \vee \psi) = 1) \wedge (\mu_i(\phi) = \mu_i(\psi)) && \text{(Axiom p4)}\\
&\to (\mu_i(\neg\phi) + \mu_i(\psi) - \mu_i(\neg\phi \wedge \psi) = 1) \wedge (\mu_i(\phi) = \mu_i(\psi)) && \text{(Axiom P3)}\\
&\to (\mu_i(\neg\phi) + \mu_i(\psi) - \mu_i(\neg\phi \wedge \psi) = 1) \wedge (\mu_i(\neg\phi) = \mu_i(\neg\psi)) && (\mu_i(\sigma) = 1 - \mu_i(\neg\sigma) \text{ in PDEL})\\
&\to (\mu_i(\neg\psi) + \mu_i(\psi) - \mu_i(\neg\phi \wedge \psi) = 1)\\
&\to (1 - \mu_i(\neg\phi \wedge \psi) = 1) && (\mu_i(\sigma) = 1 - \mu_i(\neg\sigma) \text{ in PDEL})\\
&\to (\mu_i(\neg\phi \wedge \psi) = 0) && (\mu_i(\sigma) = 1 - \mu_i(\neg\sigma) \text{ in PDEL})\\
&\to (\mu_i(\phi \vee \neg\psi) = 1) && (\mu_i(\sigma) = 1 - \mu_i(\neg\sigma) \text{ in PDEL})\\
&\to (\mu_i(\psi \to \phi) = 1)\\
&\to \Box_i(\psi \to \phi) && \text{(Axiom p4)}
\end{aligned}
$$

Proposition 11 (Soundness). *The axiomatization for IPDEL given in Table 2 is sound w.r.t. APE-models.*

Proof. By definition, the underlying structure of an APE-structures is an epistemic Heyting algebra. Hence, it satisfies the axioms of intuitionistic propositional logic and the axioms M1 – M5 for static modalities.
Axioms for inequalities: As discussed after Fact 3 it is the case that $\bigvee \mathsf{Min}_i(\mathbb{A}) = \top$ for every Epistemic Heyting algebra $\mathbb{A}$. The axioms N0 to N6 are trivially true at each i-minimal element, which by the above implies that they are satisfied in every APE-model.
Probabilities: The fact that axioms P1-P3 are satisfied in every APE-model is shown similarly as for the axioms N0-N6. Since $\Diamond_i\mathbb{A}$ is a subalgebra of $\mathbb{A}$ for every epistemic Heyting algebra $\mathbb{A}$, it is the case that $[\![\sigma]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \in \mathbb{A}$ for every i-probability formulas σ and every APE-model based on $\mathbb{A}$. Hence Fact 3 implies the satisfiability of P5. Finally let us show that P4 is satisfied in every APE-model. The right to left direction is immediate. As for the left to right, the strict monotonicity of the i-measures immediately yield the result.
Finally, the soundness of the reduction axioms is proved in Appendix A.

6 Completeness

In the present section, we prove the weak completeness of IPDEL w.r.t. APE-models. Similarly to akin logical systems (cf. [BMS99,KP13,MPS14,vBvEK06,CRR16,BR15b,Ach14]), the proof relies on a reduction procedure of IPDEL-formulas to formulas of the static fragment of IPDEL (referred to in what follows as IPEL), which preserves provable equivalence. This reduction procedure is effected using the interaction axioms and the rule of substitution of equivalent formulas, and we omit the details since they are standard. In the reminder of the present section, we prove the weak completeness of IPEL w.r.t. APE-models, i.e., we show that every APE-validity in the language of IPEL is a theorem of IPEL. By contraposition, this is equivalent to proving that for any IPEL-formula φ which is not an IPEL-theorem, there exists an APE-model $\mathcal{M}$ that does not satisfy φ in the sense that $[\![\varphi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \neq \top$. The proof will proceed as follows: We will first extract a finite sublattice of the the Lindenbaum-Tarski algebra of the logic that contains φ. We will prove that it is an Epistemic Heyting Algebra satisfying certain properties akin to those described in [FS$^+$78]. Then, following ideas from [FHM90] adapted to the algebraic setting, we will define appropriate i-measures over the finite Epistemic Heyting Algebra to turn it into an APE-model that does not satisfy φ.

6.1 The epistemic Heyting algebra $\mathbb{A}^\star_\varphi$

In this section we construct the finite epistemic Heyting algebra on which the counter-model for φ is based. The construction consists of a number of steps, starting with the Lindenbaum-Tarski algebra of $\mathcal{L}$ and restricting it accordingly.

Henceforth we let

$$\mathbb{A} = \langle A, \top_{\mathbb{A}}, \bot_{\mathbb{A}}, \vee_{\mathbb{A}}, \wedge_{\mathbb{A}}, \to_{\mathbb{A}}, (\Diamond_i)_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}}, (\Box_i)_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}}\rangle \tag{6.1}$$

denote the Lindenbaum-Tarski algebra of IPEL. We will use $\neg_{\mathbb{A}}(\bullet)$ as shorthand for $\bullet \to_{\mathbb{A}} \bot_{\mathbb{A}}$. For any agent i, we define:

$$\Diamond_i \mathbb{A} := \{\Diamond_i a \in \mathbb{A} \mid a \in \mathbb{A}\}.$$

For any formula $\sigma \in \mathcal{L}_{IPEL}$, we let $\sigma^{\mathbb{A}} \in \mathbb{A}$ denote the equivalence class of σ modulo provable equivalence in IPEL. Let

$$\mathbb{B} := \langle B, \top_{\mathbb{B}}, \bot_{\mathbb{B}}, \vee_{\mathbb{B}}, \wedge_{\mathbb{B}}, \neg_{\mathbb{B}}\rangle$$

be the Boolean Extension of the Heyting algebra reduct of $\mathbb{A}$ (see [Mac37, Section 13, page 450]).[10] To enhance readability we identify $\mathbb{A}$ with its image through the embedding $A \hookrightarrow B$. Recall that $\mathbb{A}$ is a sublattice of $\mathbb{B}$. Henceforth we will use $\vee$ and $\wedge$ and $\top$ and $\bot$ ambiguously to denote the operations on both algebras. Since $\Diamond_i \mathbb{A}$ is a Boolean algebra and in every Boolean algebra negation is unique we have that $\neg_{\mathbb{A}} a = \neg_{\mathbb{B}} a$ for every $a \in \Diamond_i \mathbb{A}$ and for every agent i.
Let φ be an IPEL-formula that is not a theorem. Let

$$S_\varphi := \{\sigma^{\mathbb{A}} \mid \sigma \text{ is a subformula of } \varphi\},$$

let Ag_φ be the set of agents that appear in φ and let $S_\varphi^{\Diamond} \supseteq S_\varphi$ be

$$S_\varphi^{\Diamond} := S_\varphi \cup \{(\Diamond_i \sigma)^{\mathbb{A}}, (\neg\Diamond_i \sigma)^{\mathbb{A}} \mid \sigma \in S_\varphi \text{ and } i \in \mathsf{Ag}_\varphi\}.$$

Notice that the sets S_φ and $S_\varphi^{\Diamond}$ are finite. Now let $\mathbb{B}_\varphi \subseteq \mathbb{B}$ be the Boolean subalgebra of $\mathbb{B}$ generated by $S_\varphi^{\Diamond}$. Since $S_\varphi^{\Diamond}$ is finite, so will be the domain of $\mathbb{B}_\varphi$ (which we denote with B_φ). It follow that $\mathbb{B}_\varphi$ is generated by its atoms. In view of what will follow let us endow $\mathbb{B}_\varphi$ with a measure $\mu_{\mathbb{B}}$ as follows: Let n be the number of atoms of $\mathbb{B}_\varphi$. For every $a \in \mathbb{B}_\varphi$ that is above exactly m atoms let $\mu_{\mathbb{B}}(a) = \frac{m}{n}$. Now let

$$\mathbb{A}_\varphi := \langle A \cap B_\varphi, \top, \bot, \wedge, \vee\rangle.$$

Notice that since both $\mathbb{A}$ and $\mathbb{B}_\varphi$ are distributive lattices, so will be $\mathbb{A}_\varphi$. For every agent $i \in \mathsf{Ag}_\varphi$, we define

$$A_\varphi^{\Diamond_i} := \{a \in \mathbb{A}_\varphi \mid \text{ there exists } \sigma \in \mathcal{L} \text{ such that } \Diamond_i \sigma \in a\} = A_\varphi \cap \Diamond_i \mathbb{A}.$$

Notice that if $a \in A_\varphi^{\Diamond_i}$ then $\neg_{\mathbb{A}} a \in A_\varphi^{\Diamond_i}$ as well (since $\neg_{\mathbb{B}} a \in B_\varphi$ and $\neg_{\mathbb{B}} a = \neg_{\mathbb{A}} a$). Hence for every agent i, $\langle A_\varphi^{\Diamond_i}, \top, \bot, \wedge, \vee, \neg_{\mathbb{A}}\rangle$ is a Boolean subalgebra of $\mathbb{A}_\varphi$. We are now ready to endow $\mathbb{A}_\varphi$ with an epistemic Heyting algebra structure.

Definition 26. *Let*

$$\mathbb{A}_\varphi^\star := \langle \mathbb{A}_\varphi, \to^\star, (\Diamond_i^\star)_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}}, (\Box_i^\star)_{i\in \mathsf{Ag}}\rangle$$

where, for all $a, b \in \mathbb{A}_\varphi$,

$$a \to^\star b := \bigvee\{c \in \mathbb{A}_\varphi \mid c \le a \to_{\mathbb{A}} b\} = \bigvee\{c \in \mathbb{A}_\varphi \mid c \wedge a \le b\},$$

$$\Diamond_i^\star a := \bigwedge\{b \in A_\varphi^{\Diamond_i} \mid a \le b\} \qquad \Box_i^\star a := \bigvee\{b \in A_\varphi^{\Diamond_i} \mid b \le a\} \qquad \text{for } i \in \mathsf{Ag}_\varphi$$

$$\Diamond_i^\star a := \begin{cases} \top & \text{if } a \neq \bot, \\ \bot & \text{if } a = \bot \end{cases} \qquad \Box_i^\star a := \begin{cases} \bot & \text{if } a \neq \top, \\ \top & \text{if } a = \top \end{cases} \qquad \text{for } i \notin \mathsf{Ag}_\varphi$$

The operations above are well defined since $\mathbb{A}_\varphi$ is a finite distributive lattice and hence all the joins and meets exist.

Lemma 9. *For every $i \in \mathsf{Ag}_\varphi$, the algebra $\mathbb{A}_\varphi^\star$ satisfies the following properties:*

1. $\Diamond_i^\star \mathbb{A}_\varphi^\star = \{\Diamond_i^\star a \mid a \in \mathbb{A}_\varphi^\star\} \subseteq A_\varphi^{\Diamond_i}$;
2. $\Diamond_i^\star \mathbb{A}_\varphi^\star = \Box_i^\star \mathbb{A}_\varphi^\star$;

[10] The Boolean extension of $\mathbb{A}$ can be identified with the algebra of clopens of the Esakia space dual to $\mathbb{A}$. Notice that this is exactly the same construction semantically underlying the Gödel-Tarski translation (cf. [CPZ, Section 3] for an expanded discussion).

3. *for all* $a \in A_\varphi^{\Diamond_i}$, *it holds that* $\Diamond_i^\star a = a$ *and* $\Box_i^\star a = a$;
4. *for all* $a, b \in \mathbb{A}_\varphi^\star$, *if* $a \to_{\mathbb{A}} b \in \mathbb{A}_\varphi^\star$, *then* $a \to^\star b = a \to_{\mathbb{A}} b$;
5. *for all* $a \in \mathbb{A}_\varphi^\star$, *if* $\Diamond_i a \in \mathbb{A}_\varphi^\star$ *(resp.* $\Box_i a \in \mathbb{A}_\varphi^\star$*), then* $\Diamond_i^\star a = \Diamond_i a$ *(resp.* $\Box_i^\star a = \Box_i a$*);*
6. *for all formulas* $\psi, \varphi \in \mathcal{L}$, *if* $(\Diamond_i \psi)^{\mathbb{A}} \in S_\varphi^\Diamond$ *(resp.* $(\Box_i \psi)^{\mathbb{A}} \in S_\varphi^\Diamond$ *or* $(\psi \to \chi)^{\mathbb{A}} \in S_\varphi^\Diamond$*), then* $\Diamond_i^\star \psi^{\mathbb{A}} = \Diamond_i \psi^{\mathbb{A}}$ *(resp.* $\Box_i^\star \psi^{\mathbb{A}} = \Box_i \psi^{\mathbb{A}}$ *or* $\psi^{\mathbb{A}} \to^\star \chi^{\mathbb{A}} = \psi^{\mathbb{A}} \to_{\mathbb{A}} \chi^{\mathbb{A}}$*).*

Proof. The first five items follow immediately from the definition of $\Diamond_i^\star$ and $\Box_i^\star$. The last item is an application of items 4 and 5.

Lemma 10. *The algebra* $\mathbb{A}_\varphi^\star$ *is an epistemic Heyting algebra.*

Proof. As mentioned early on, $\mathbb{A}_\varphi$ is a distributive lattice. Moreover, by definition, $\to^\star$ is the right residual of $\wedge$ in $\mathbb{A}_\varphi$. This shows that $\mathbb{A}_\varphi^\star$ is a Heyting algebra. For every $i \notin \mathsf{Ag}_\varphi$ it is routine to check that the axioms M1 to M6 and E hold. So let $i \in \mathsf{Ag}_\varphi$. By definition, it immediately follows that $\Diamond_i^\star$ and $\Box_i^\star$ verify axioms M1 and M2. Axiom M3 holds because $\Diamond_i^\star a \vee \Diamond_i^\star b \in \Diamond_i \mathbb{A}_\varphi$ and $a \vee b \leq \Diamond_i^\star a \vee \Diamond_i^\star b$ (and similarly for axiom M4).
As for axioms M5 and M6, since $\Diamond_i^\star a, \Box_i^\star a \in \Diamond_i \mathbb{A}_\varphi$, by item 3 of Lemma 9 we obtain that $\Diamond_i^\star \Box_i^\star a = \Box_i^\star a$ and $\Diamond_i^\star a = \Box_i^\star \Diamond_i^\star a$, which imply the axioms.
In the context of axioms M1 through M6, axiom M7 is equivalent to $\Diamond_i(\Diamond_i p \to \Diamond_i q) \to (\Diamond_i p \to \Diamond_i q)$ (see [Bez98, Lemma 2]), so let us show that $\mathbb{A}_\varphi^\star$ satisfies $\Diamond_i(\Diamond_i p \to \Diamond_i q) \to (\Diamond_i p \to \Diamond_i q)$. Observe that for all $a, b \in \mathbb{A}_\varphi^\star$, since $\Diamond_i^\star a, \Diamond_i^\star b \in A_\varphi^{\Diamond_i}$ and $A_\varphi^{\Diamond_i}$ is a Boolean algebra (and hence contains $\neg_{\mathbb{A}} \Diamond_i^\star a$), we have that

$$\Diamond_i^\star a \to_{\mathbb{A}} \Diamond_i^\star b = \neg_{\mathbb{A}} \Diamond_i^\star a \vee \Diamond_i^\star b \quad \in \quad A_\varphi^{\Diamond_i}$$

which implies by item 4 of Lemma 9 that

$$\Diamond_i^\star a \to^\star \Diamond_i^\star b = \Diamond_i^\star a \to_{\mathbb{A}} \Diamond_i^\star b. \tag{6.2}$$

Now, by item 3 of Lemma 9, we have that

$$\Diamond_i^\star(\Diamond_i^\star a \to_{\mathbb{A}} \Diamond_i^\star b) = \Diamond_i^\star a \to_{\mathbb{A}} \Diamond_i^\star b$$

which by the equation 6.2 is equivalent to

$$\Diamond_i^\star(\Diamond_i^\star a \to^\star \Diamond_i^\star b) = \Diamond_i^\star a \to^\star \Diamond_i^\star b,$$

that is, $\mathbb{A}_\varphi^\star$ satisfies $\Diamond_i(\Diamond_i p \to \Diamond_i q) \to (\Diamond_i p \to \Diamond_i q)$.
Finally, axiom E follows immediately from item 4 of Lemma 9 and from the fact that $A_\varphi^{\Diamond_i}$ is a Boolean algebra. Hence if $a \in A_\varphi^{\Diamond_i}$ then $(a \to_{\mathbb{A}} \bot_{\mathbb{A}}) \in A_\varphi^{\Diamond_i}$.

6.2 Measures on $\mathbb{A}_\varphi^\star$

In this section, for each agent $i \in \mathsf{Ag}_\varphi$, we will define an i-measure on the algebra $\mathbb{A}_\varphi^\star$ and a valuation on $\mathbb{A}_\varphi^\star$ so as to define an APE-model $\mathcal{M}_\varphi$ such that $[\![\sigma]\!]_{\mathcal{M}_\varphi} = \sigma^{\mathbb{A}}$ for every subformula σ of φ. Before defining the measures, we will state some auxiliary results.

Lemma 11. *The system IPEL proves all classical truths about linear inequalities.*

Proof. See [FHM90] for an explanation why N0 to N6 are enough. Notice that, even though the result is proven for classical logic, it still holds for IPEL. Indeed, the fragment of the logic involving inequalities is classical because of the axiom N5. $(\tau \geq \beta) \vee (\neg\tau \geq \beta)$.

Lemma 12. *The formulas*

$$\left(\Diamond_i \psi \wedge \left(\sum_m \alpha_m \mu_i(\phi_m) \geq \beta\right)\right) \to \left(\sum_m \alpha_m \mu_i(\phi_m \wedge \Diamond_i \psi) \geq \beta\right) \tag{6.3}$$

and

$$\left(\Diamond_i \psi \wedge \left(\sum_m \alpha_m \mu_i(\phi_m) < \beta\right)\right) \to \left(\sum_m \alpha_m \mu_i(\phi_m \wedge \Diamond_i \psi) < \beta\right) \tag{6.4}$$

are provable in IPEL.

Proof. We only prove (6.3), the proof of (6.4) being almost verbatim. Early on we observed (cf. Lemma 8) that axiom P4 implies the validity of $\Box_i\varphi \leftrightarrow (\mu_i(\varphi) = 1)$. This and axiom M5 (i.e. $\Diamond_i\psi \leftrightarrow \Box_i\Diamond_i\psi$) imply

$$\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} \Diamond_i\psi \leftrightarrow (\mu_i(\Diamond_i\psi) = 1). \tag{6.5}$$

Since $\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} \Diamond_i\psi \to (\Diamond_i\psi \vee \phi_m)$ for every $\phi_m \in \mathcal{L}$, by rule Sub_μ we obtain

$$\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} \mu_i(\Diamond_i\psi) \leq \mu_i(\Diamond_i\psi \vee \phi_m). \tag{6.6}$$

From (6.6) and Lemma 11, we deduce that

$$\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} \mu_i(\Diamond_i\psi) = 1 \to \mu_i(\phi_m \vee \Diamond_i\psi) = 1. \tag{6.7}$$

Lemma 11 and axiom P3 (i.e. $\mu_i(\phi_m) = \mu_i(\phi_m \vee \Diamond_i\psi) + \mu_i(\phi_m \wedge \Diamond_i\psi) - \mu_i(\Diamond_i\psi)$) entail

$$\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} \left(\sum_m \alpha_m\mu_i(\phi_m) \geq \beta\right) \leftrightarrow \left(\sum_m \alpha_m\Big(\mu_i(\phi_m \wedge \Diamond_i\psi) + \mu_i(\phi_m \vee \Diamond_i\psi) - \mu_i(\Diamond_i\psi)\Big) \geq \beta\right). \tag{6.8}$$

Combining (6.5), (6.7) and (6.8), we obtain

$$\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} \Big(\Diamond_i\psi \wedge A\Big) \to \Big(\big(\mu_i(\Diamond_i\psi) = 1\big) \wedge \bigwedge_m \big(\mu_i(\phi_m \vee \Diamond_i\psi) = 1\big) \wedge B\Big). \tag{6.9}$$

with

$$A := \sum_m \alpha_m\mu_i(\phi_m) \geq \beta,$$

and

$$B := \sum_m \alpha_m(\mu_i(\phi_m \wedge \Diamond_i\psi) + \mu_i(\phi_m \vee \Diamond_i\psi) - \mu_i(\Diamond_i\psi)) \geq \beta.$$

Again, by using Lemma 11, we obtain that

$$\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} \left((\mu_i(\Diamond_i\psi) = 1) \wedge \bigwedge_m (\mu_i(\phi_m \vee \Diamond_i\psi) = 1) \wedge B\right) \to D \tag{6.10}$$

with

$$D := \sum_m \alpha_m\mu_i(\phi_m \wedge \Diamond_i\psi) \geq \beta.$$

Putting (6.9) and (6.10) together, we finally get:

$$\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} \left(\Diamond_i\psi \wedge \sum_m \alpha_m\mu_i(\phi_m) \geq \beta\right) \to \left(\sum_m \alpha_m\mu_i(\phi_m \wedge \Diamond_i\psi) \geq \beta\right)$$

as desired.

Observe that for any agent $i \in \mathsf{Ag}_\varphi$, since $\mathbb{A}^\star_\varphi$ is finite and $\Diamond^\star_i\mathbb{A}^\star_\varphi = A^{\Diamond_i}_\varphi$ is a Boolean algebra, it is the case that the i-minimal elements are the atoms of this Boolean algebra and every element of $\mathbb{A}^{\Diamond_i}_\varphi$ can be written as the union of some of these i-minimal elements. Let us call a^i_k for $k \in n_i$ the i-minimal elements of $\mathbb{A}^\star_\varphi$. Now each i-probability formula σ with $\sigma^{\mathbb{A}} \in S^\Diamond_\varphi$ since $\sigma^{\mathbb{A}} \in A^{\Diamond_i}_\varphi$ we have that $(\neg\sigma)^{\mathbb{A}} \in A^{\Diamond_i}_\varphi$ and that there exists a function $f_\sigma : n_i \to 2$ such that $\sigma^{\mathbb{A}} = \bigvee_{f_\sigma(k)=1} a^i_k$ and $(\neg\sigma)^{\mathbb{A}} = \bigvee_{f_\sigma(k)=0} a^i_k$. It should be stressed that since $\vee$ and $\wedge$ in $\mathbb{A}^\star_\varphi$ are inherited by $\mathbb{A}$, these equalities hold in $\mathbb{A}$ as well.
Now let us fix $i \in \mathsf{Ag}_\varphi$. For every $k \in n_i$ we will define a system of equations $E_{a^i_k}$, with variables x_b for every $b \leq a^i_k$ as follows:

$$E_{a^i_k} := \begin{pmatrix} \sum \alpha_m \cdot x^i_{\psi^{\mathbb{A}}_m \wedge a^i_k} \geq \beta, & \text{for all } \sigma := (\sum \alpha_m \cdot \mu_i(\psi_m) \geq \beta) \text{ with } \sigma^{\mathbb{A}} \in S^\Diamond_\varphi \text{ and } f_\sigma(k) = 1 \\ \sum \alpha_m \cdot x^i_{\psi^{\mathbb{A}}_m \wedge a^i_k} < \beta, & \text{for all } \sigma := (\sum \alpha_m \cdot \mu_i(\psi_m) \geq \beta) \text{ with } \sigma^{\mathbb{A}} \in S^\Diamond_\varphi \text{ and } f_\sigma(k) = 0 \\ x^i_b \geq 0 \text{ and } x_b \leq 1, & \text{for all } b \in \mathbb{A}^\star_\varphi \text{ with } b \leq a^i_k \\ x^i_b + x^i_c = x^i_{b\wedge c} + x^i_{b\vee c}, & \text{for all } b, c \in \mathbb{A}^\star_\varphi \text{ with } b, c \leq a^i_k \\ x^i_b \leq x^i_c, & \text{for all } b, c \in \mathbb{A}^\star_\varphi \text{ with } b \leq c \leq a^i_k \\ x^i_\bot = 0 & \\ x^i_{a^i_k} = 1 & \end{pmatrix}$$

For a solution s of the above system, we denote with $(x_b^i)^s$ the solution according to s of x_b^i. Observe that for every $b \leq a_k^i$ there exists a formula τ_b such that $b = \tau_b^{\mathbb{A}}$, such that if $b \leq c$ then $\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} \tau_b \to \tau_c$. Now let $E^{\tau}_{a_k^i}$ be the system of equations where each x_b^i is replaced by $\mu_i(\tau_b)$. Since a_k^i is i-minimal we can assume without loss of generality that $\tau_{a_k^i}$ is of the form $\Diamond_i \tau'$. Furthermore, let $PS_i \subseteq S^{\Diamond}_{\varphi}$ be the set of i-probability formulas and for every $\sigma^{\mathbb{A}} \in PS_i$ such that $\sigma := (\sum \alpha_m \cdot \mu_i(\psi_m) \geq \beta)$ let $\sigma[a_k^i]$ be the formula $\sum \alpha_m \cdot \mu_i(\psi_m \wedge \tau_{a_k^i}) \geq \beta$.

Lemma 13. *For every $k \in n_i$ the system $E_{a_k^i}$ has a solution.*

Proof. Notice that all but the first two types of inequalities are provable in IPEL. Heading towards a contradiction, let us first assume that $E_{a_k^i}$ does not have a solution at all. This is a truth about linear inequalities of rational numbers and hence by Lemma 11 it is provable in IPDEL. Since some inequalities are provable this is tantamount to saying that

$$\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} \neg\big(\big(\bigwedge_{\substack{\sigma^{\mathbb{A}} \in PS_i \\ f_\sigma(k)=1}} \sigma[a_k^i]\big) \wedge \big(\bigwedge_{\substack{\sigma^{\mathbb{A}} \in PS_i \\ f_\sigma(k)=0}} \neg\sigma[a_k^i]\big)\big).$$

Notice that for every $\sigma^{\mathbb{A}} \in PS_i$ by Lemma 12 we have that

$$\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} \sigma \wedge \tau_{a_k^i} \to \sigma[a_k^i]$$

and

$$\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} \neg\sigma \wedge \tau_{a_k^i} \to \neg\sigma[a_k^i].$$

Therefore

$$\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} \Big(\big(\bigwedge_{\substack{\sigma^{\mathbb{A}} \in PS_i \\ f_\sigma(k)=1}} \sigma\big) \wedge \big(\bigwedge_{\substack{\sigma^{\mathbb{A}} \in PS_i \\ f_\sigma(k)=0}} \neg\sigma\big) \wedge \tau_{a_k^i}\Big) \to \big(\big(\bigwedge_{\substack{\sigma^{\mathbb{A}} \in PS_i \\ f_\sigma(k)=1}} \sigma[a_k^i]\big) \wedge \big(\bigwedge_{\substack{\sigma^{\mathbb{A}} \in PS_i \\ f_\sigma(k)=0}} \neg\sigma[a_k^i]\big)\big).$$

Since one direction of contraposition is provable in intiontionistic logic we obtain that:

$$\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} \Big(\neg\big(\big(\bigwedge_{\substack{\sigma^{\mathbb{A}} \in PS_i \\ f_\sigma(k)=1}} \sigma[a_k^i]\big) \wedge \big(\bigwedge_{\substack{\sigma^{\mathbb{A}} \in PS_i \\ f_\sigma(k)=0}} \neg\sigma[a_k^i]\big)\big)\Big) \to \neg\Big(\big(\big(\bigwedge_{\substack{\sigma^{\mathbb{A}} \in PS_i \\ f_\sigma(k)=1}} \sigma\big) \wedge \big(\bigwedge_{\substack{\sigma^{\mathbb{A}} \in PS_i \\ f_\sigma(k)=0}} \neg\sigma\big)\big) \wedge \tau_{a_k^i}\Big)$$

which in turn implies that from the above that

$$\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} \neg\Big(\big(\big(\bigwedge_{\substack{\sigma^{\mathbb{A}} \in PS_i \\ f_\sigma(k)=1}} \sigma\big) \wedge \big(\bigwedge_{\substack{\sigma^{\mathbb{A}} \in PS_i \\ f_\sigma(k)=0}} \neg\sigma\big)\big) \wedge \tau_{a_k^i}\Big).$$

But we have that for all $\sigma \in PS_i$ if $f_\sigma(k) = 1$ then $\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} \tau_{a_k^i} \to \sigma$ and if $f_\sigma(k) = 0$ then $\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} \tau_{a_k^i} \to \neg\sigma$ because $\mathbb{A}^{\star}_{\varphi}$ inherits the order from $\mathbb{A}$ and by construction $a_k^i \leq \sigma^{\mathbb{A}}$ when $f_\sigma(k) = 1$ and $a_k^i \leq (\neg\sigma)^{\mathbb{A}}$ when $f_\sigma(k) = 0$. Hence we have

$$\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} \neg\tau_{a_k^i}.$$

We have reached a contradiction because a_k^i is an element of $\mathbb{A}$ different from $\bot$ and hence each formula corresponding to it is consistent. Therefore $E_{a_k^i}$ has a solution.

Lemma 14. *For every $k \in n_i$ and every $b < c \leq a_k^i$ the system $E_{a_k^i}$ has a solution $s_{b,c}$ such that $(x_b^i)^{s_{b,c}} < (x_c^i)^{s_{b,c}}$.*

Proof. Heading towards a contradiction let there be $b, c \leq a_k^i$ such that $b < c$ but in every solution s of $E_{a_k^i}$, it is the case that $(x_b^i)^s = (x_c^i)^s$. This is a fact of inequalities of real numbers and therefore by Lemma 11 it is provable in IPEL. Hence we have

$$\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} \big(\big(\bigwedge_{\substack{\sigma^{\mathbb{A}} \in PS_i \\ f_\sigma(k)=1}} \sigma[a_k^i]\big) \wedge \big(\bigwedge_{\substack{\sigma^{\mathbb{A}} \in PS_i \\ f_\sigma(k)=0}} \neg\sigma[a_k^i]\big)\big) \to \mu_i(\tau_b) = \mu_i(\tau_c).$$

Since $\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} \tau_b \to \tau_c$, necessitation implies $\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} \Box_i(\tau_b \to \tau_c)$ that using axiom P4 we obtain that

$$\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} \big((\bigwedge_{\substack{\sigma^{\mathbb{A}} \in PS_i \\ f_\sigma(k)=1}} \sigma[a_k^i]) \wedge (\bigwedge_{\substack{\sigma^{\mathbb{A}} \in PS_i \\ f_\sigma(k)=0}} \neg\sigma[a_k^i])\big) \to \Box_i(\tau_c \to \tau_b).$$

Using Lemma 12 and the fact (explained above) that

$$\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} \tau_{a_k^i} \to \big((\bigwedge_{\substack{\sigma^{\mathbb{A}} \in PS_i \\ f_\sigma(k)=1}} \sigma[a_k^i]) \wedge (\bigwedge_{\substack{\sigma^{\mathbb{A}} \in PS_i \\ f_\sigma(k)=0}} \neg\sigma[a_k^i])\big)$$

we have that

$$\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} \tau_{a_k^i} \to \Box_i(\tau_c \to \tau_b).$$

By axiom M2 we have

$$\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} \tau_{a_k^i} \to (\tau_c \to \tau_b),$$

which is equivalent to

$$\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} (\tau_{a_k^i} \wedge \tau_c) \to \tau_b.$$

Since $\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} \tau_c \to \tau_{a_k^i}$ the above implies that

$$\vdash_{\mathrm{IPEL}} \tau_c \to \tau_b,$$

a contradiction since in $\mathbb{A}$, the Lindenbaum-Tarski algebra of IPEL, we have that $c \not\leq b$. Therefore for every such pair $b < c \leq a_k^i$ there exists a solution $s_{b,c}$ of $E_{a_k^i}$ such that $(x_b^i)^{s_{b,c}} < (x_c^i)^{s_{b,c}}$.

Lemma 15. *For every $k \in n_i$ the system $E_{a_k^i}$ has a solution s, such that $(x_b^i)^s < (x_c^i)^s$ for all $b, c \leq a_k^i$ with $b < c$.*

Proof. By Lemma 14, for every pair $b < c \leq a_k^i$ there exists a solution $s_{b,c}$ of $E_{a_k^i}$ such that $(x_b^i)^{s_{b,c}} < (x_c^i)^{s_{b,c}}$. Now notice that the solution space of $E_{a_k^i}$ is a convex subspace of $\mathbb{R}^l$, for some natural number l. Indeed it is immediate that the solutions of each linear inequality define a convex space and the intersection of convex spaces is a convex space (cf. [Lan13, Chapter 12]). Let n be the number of aforementioned solutions. Then by [Lan13, Chapter 12, Theorem 1.2] it is the case that $\sum_{b<c\leq a_k^i} \frac{1}{n} s_{b,c}$ is also a solution of $E_{a_k^i}$. Let us call this solution s. We claim that in s if $d < e$ it follows that $(x_d^i)^s < (x_e^i)^s$. Indeed, for every $s_{b,c}$ it is the case that $(x_d^i)^{s_{b,c}} \leq (x_e^i)^{s_{b,c}}$ by the restraints of the system and $(x_d^i)^{s_{d,e}} < (x_e^i)^{s_{d,e}}$. Hence

$$(x_d^i)^s = \sum_{b<c} \frac{1}{n} (x_d^i)^{s_{b,c}} < \sum_{b<c} \frac{1}{n} (x_e^i)^{s_{b,c}} = (x_e^i)^s.$$

Therefore solutions s satisfies the conditions required.

For every agent $i \in \mathsf{Ag}_\varphi$ and every $E_{a_k^i}$ pick a solution s satisfying the conditions of Lemma 15 and define $\mu_i(b) = (x_b^i)^s$, for every $b \in \mathsf{Min}(\mathbb{A}_\varphi^\star)\!\downarrow$. For agents $j \notin \mathsf{Ag}_\varphi$ let $\mu_j(b) = \mu_{\mathbb{B}}(b)$. Now we define an APE-model

$$\mathcal{M}_\varphi = \langle \mathbb{A}_\varphi^\star, (\mu_i)_{i\in\mathsf{Ag}}, v\rangle \tag{6.11}$$

such that for every $p \in AtProp \cap S_\varphi^\Diamond$ it holds that $v(p) = p^{\mathbb{A}}$.

Lemma 16. *The model $\mathcal{M}_\varphi$ is an APE-model.*

Proof. By the system of inequalities and the conditions of Lemma 15 it is straightforward to see that this indeed constitutes an APE-model.

Lemma 17 (Truth Lemma). *For every $\psi \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\psi^{\mathbb{A}} \in S_\varphi^\Diamond$ it is the case that*

$$[\![\psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}_\varphi} = \psi^{\mathbb{A}}.$$

Proof. It is the case that $S^{\Diamond}_{\varphi}$ is closed under subformulas. The proof proceeds by induction on the complexity of ψ. For the atomic variables, this follows immediately from the definition of v. For formulas of the form $\psi \wedge \tau$ and $\psi \vee \tau$ this follows from the fact that $\mathbb{A}^{\star}_{\varphi}$ inherits $\vee$ and $\wedge$ from $\mathbb{A}$. For formulas of the form $\psi \to \tau$, $\Diamond_i \psi$ and $\Box_i \psi$ it follows from item 6 of Lemma 9. Finally for probability formulas of the form $\sigma := \sum \alpha_m \mu_i(\psi_m) \geq \beta$ notice that by the choice of μ_i exactly the i-minimal elements below $\sigma^{\mathbb{A}}$ satisfy σ, hence $[\![\sigma]\!]_{\mathcal{M}_\varphi} = \sigma^{\mathbb{A}}$ by definition. This concludes the proof.

Proposition 12 (Completeness). *The axiomatization for IPDEL given in Table 2 is weakly complete w.r.t. APE-models.*

Proof. As discussed in the beginning of this section, the problem is reduced to proving the completeness of IPEL. Let φ be an IPEL formula that is not a theorem. This means that $\varphi^{\mathbb{A}} \neq \top^{\mathbb{A}}$, where $\mathbb{A}$ is the Lindembaum-Tarski algebra of IPEL (cf. (6.1)). By Lemma 16, the model $\mathcal{M}_\varphi$ based on the algebra $\mathbb{A}^{\star}_{\varphi}$ defined in (6.11) is an APE-model. By Lemma 17, $[\![\varphi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}_\varphi} = \varphi^{\mathbb{A}}$. Since $\top^{\mathbb{A}^{\star}_{\varphi}} = \top^{\mathbb{A}}$, this shows that $[\![\varphi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}_\varphi} \neq \top^{\mathbb{A}^{\star}_{\varphi}}$, as required.

7 Relational semantics: a sneak preview

The development of relational semantics for intuitionistic probabilistic epistemic logic involves the dualization process of probability measures to probability distributions. This requires not only technical details but also conceptual insight into intuitionistic knowledge and probabilities. Therefore we consider it worthwhile to pursue this in a separate study in [CFPT]. In the present section we show the end product of this dualization process in a simple case study that involves the assessment of a financial investment.
The focal feature of the case study is that the profitability of the financial investment depends not only on factual information but more so on the beliefs and expectations of the agents.
In what follows, first we informally present the case study and then we introduce a simplified formalization of the problem with probabilistic intuitionistic Kripke models and probabilistic intuitionistic epistemic event structures.

7.1 Informal presentation

The art industry provides a very good example of an environment where truth is socially constructed and procedural. Indeed, questions such as 'Is this painting beautiful?', 'Is this artist talented?', 'Is this painting worth its price?', 'At which price should the painting p be sold?' do not have an objective answer. Art critics, experts, buyers have their own, often conflicting, opinions that shape and are shaped by the socially emerging answer. It is from this setting that we will draw our case.

Description of the situation. In this example we focus on one investor i who wants to decide whether buying a painting of the young artist a would be a good investment. To make this decision, the investor looks at different parameters such as the reviews the artist's work received during recent years, the price at which his previews paintings were sold, or the number and quality of exhibitions the artist had.
Attempting to model this situation in full generality would be a very complex task. Here we present a formalization of a simplified version of this scenario.

Simplified scenario. An investor i wonders whether it is a good idea to invest in some artist a. To decide, i looks at the public announcements regarding a's work being exhibited in an art gallery g. In this example we consider the following set of agents $\mathsf{Ag} := \{a, i, g\}$ where:

- i is the investor,
- a is the artist,
- g is a top art gallery.

Let p be the variable standing for:

'It is a good investment to buy a painting of the artist a to sell it in five years.'

To decide whether or not to invest in artist a, the investor searches for exhibitions of the artist's work in the top art gallery g. Either there is (or has been) an exhibition of the artist's work this year or not. Having an exhibition is positive signalling. Indeed, it indicates that the owner of the gallery believes that the artist is talented and it generates publicity for the artist. This, in turn, increases their chances of success and the chances that their paintings will become more valuable. However, not having an exhibition sends a more complex signal. Indeed, a is assumed to be a young artist whose work is not well known. Hence it may be that the artist did not apply to have their work exhibited, or that they were rejected by the gallery either on grounds that they are not well recognised or simply because their work is not good enough.
Let `Exhibit` be the variable standing for:

'The artist a exhibits their work in the top gallery g,'

and `Apply` be the variable standing for:

'The artist a applies to exhibit their work in the top gallery g.'

7.2 Formalization: initial model and event structure

Let the set of atomic propositions be $\mathsf{AtProp} := \{p, \texttt{Exhibit}, \texttt{Apply}\}$.

Initial model. In this example, we are only interested in the opinion of the investor i; hence, for the model and for the event structure we specify only the subjective probabilities of agent i. The initial model

$$\mathbb{M} := (S, \leq, \{\sim_j\}_{j\in\mathsf{Ag}}, \{P_j\}_{j\in\mathsf{Ag}}, [\![\cdot]\!])$$

with:

- $S := \{s_0, s_1, s_2\}$;
- $\leq := \{(s,s) \mid s \in S\} \cup \{(s_0, s_1), (s_0, s_2)\}$;
- $\sim_j := S \times S$ for all $j \in \mathsf{Ag}$;
- $P_j : S \to [0,1]$ with
  - $\sum_{s\in S} P_j(s) = 1$ for all $j \in \mathsf{Ag}$,
  - $P_i(s_0) := 0.6$, $P_i(s_1) := 0.3$ and $P_i(s_2) := 0.1$,
  - P_a and P_g are not determined;
- $[\![\cdot]\!] : \mathsf{AtProp} \to \mathcal{P}S$ is such that $[\![p]\!] := \{s_1\}$.

This model represent a situation where the investor is very uncertain about p, however considers that there are more chances for p to be true than for $\neg p$ to be true. The model $\mathbb{M}$ is draw in Figure 3.



Fig. 3. Initial model $\mathbb{M}$: the agent is sceptical about p

Event structure. To formalize this situation, we consider the following pointed event structure:

$$(\mathbb{E}, e_1) := (E, \{\sim_j\}_{j\in\mathsf{Ag}}, \{P_j\}_{j\in\mathsf{Ag}}, \Phi, \mathsf{pre}, \mathbf{sub})$$

where

- $E := \{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$;
- $\sim_j \subseteq E \times E$ for all $j \in \mathsf{Ag}$, and
  - $\sim_i := \{(e,e) \mid e \in E\} \cup \{(e_2, e_3)\}$,
  - $\sim_a = \sim_g := \{(e,e) \mid e \in E\}$;
- $P_j : E \to [0,1]$ with
  - $P_j(e) = 1$ for all $j \in \{a, g\}$ and $e \in E$,
  - $P_i(e_1) = 1$ and $P_i(e_2) + P_i(e_3) = 1$ with $P_i(e_2) = 0.9$ and $P_i(e_3) = 0.1$;
- $\Phi = \{\top, p, \neg p\}$,
- $\mathsf{pre} : E \times \Phi$ is given by the Figure 5.



Fig. 4. Event structure $\mathbb{E}$

	e_1	e_2	e_3
$\top$	0.1	0.5	0.4
p	0.3	0.6	0.1
$\neg p$	0.01	0.39	0.6

Fig. 5. The map pre

- the definition of the map $\mathbf{sub} : E \times \{\mathtt{Apply}, \mathtt{Exhibit}\} \to \mathcal{L}$ is given by the Figure 6.

	e_1	e_2	e_3
`Apply`	$\top$	$\top$	$\bot$
`Exhibit`	$\top$	$\bot$	$\bot$

Fig. 6. The map **sub**

The event structure $\mathbb{E}$ is partially represented by the Figure 4. As for the model $\mathbb{M}$ we write only the subjective probabilities of the investor i. Indeed, the probability attributed to each event by the artist a and the gallery g is always 1.
The event structure $\mathbb{E}$ aims at describing the announcement that the artist a has or does not have an exhibition in the top art gallery g. The events have the following meaning:

- e_1 is the event in which the artist's request for an exhibition in the gallery g was accepted,
- e_2 is the event in which the artist's request for an exhibition in the gallery g was rejected, and
- e_3 is the event in which the artist did not ask to have an exhibition in the gallery g.

The events e_2 and e_3 are indistinguishable to the investor i, while all the events are distinguishable to the gallery g and the artist a. Indeed, the investor i is neither informed of the decision process of the art gallery g nor of the list of candidates.
By stipulating that $P_i(e_2) = 0.9$ and $P_i(e_3) = 0.1$, we indicate that the investor believes that it very likely the artist a attempted to get their work exhibited in the gallery g.
The map pre provides the objective probability $\mathsf{pre}(e \mid \phi)$ of each event $e \in E$ happening when one assumes that the formula $\phi \in \Phi$ holds. Each line of Figure 5 gives the probability distribution $\mathsf{pre}(\bullet \mid \phi) : E \times [0,1]$ for each $\phi \in \Phi$. The values in Figure 5 are based on the following assumptions:

- If we don't assume anything about p, namely if we consider the row where $\phi = \top$, we stipulate that the probability for the artist a to exhibit their work is very small (i.e. $\mathsf{pre}(e_1 \mid \top) = 0.1$) because g is a top gallery. In addition, since the only thing we know about the artist a is that they are not well recognised, we assume that the probability that they do not apply to exhibit at a top gallery is quite high but still less than the probability that they apply; hence, we put $\mathsf{pre}(e_2 \mid \top) = 0.5$ and $\mathsf{pre}(e_3 \mid \top) = 0.4$.

- If we assume that the artist a is a good investment (i.e. $\phi = p$), we consider that they have good chances to exhibit their work in the gallery g. We assume that $\mathsf{pre}(e_1 \mid p)$ is only 0.3, because g is a top gallery, hence it is very difficult to get to exhibit one's work at g. In addition, since the artist a is promising we assume that they were encouraged to apply to exhibit their work. Thus we assume that it is unlikely that they do not apply: namely $\mathsf{pre}(e_2 \mid p) = 0.6$ and $\mathsf{pre}(e_3 \mid p) = 0.1$.
- If we assume that the artist a is not a good investment (i.e. $\phi = \neg p$), we consider that their chances to exhibit their work in the top gallery g are close to 0, i.e. $\mathsf{pre}(e_1 \mid \neg p) = 0.01$. In addition, we assume that the artist a was discouraged from applying to exhibit their work, i.e. $\mathsf{pre}(e_2 \mid \neg p) = 0.39$ and $\mathsf{pre}(e_3 \mid \neg p) = 0.6$.

Remark 8. If we consider the ordering relation given by $\to$, the poset Φ is a forest, and more specifically in this example Φ is a tree (see Figure 7 and cf. Remark 6).



Fig. 7. The partial order given by $(\Phi, \to)$

7.3 Updated model

In this section, we aim to illustrate how the relational semantics for intuitionistic PDEL can be applied. Therefore, we present a few details on how to compute the updated model and focus on analysing the outcome. A thorough exposition of the relational semantics and updates will be presented in [CFPT]. In this example we assume that the event that actually happens is $(\mathbb{E}, e_1)$. The updated model

$$\mathbb{M}^{(\mathbb{E},e_1} := (S', \leq', \{\sim'_j\}_{j\in\mathsf{Ag}}, \{P'_j\}_{j\in\mathsf{Ag}}, [\![\cdot]\!]')$$

is defined as follows:

- $S' := \{(s, e) \in S \times E\}$;
- For every $(s, e), (s', e') \in S'$ $(s, e) \leq' (s', e')$ iff $s \leq s'$ and $e = e'$;
- For every $(s, e), (s', e') \in S'$ $(s, e) \sim'_j (s', e')$ iff $s \sim_j s'$ and $e \sim_j e'$;
- for every $j \in \mathsf{Ag}$, the map P'_j is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} P'_j : \quad & S' \to]0, 1] \\ & (s, e) \mapsto \frac{P_i^{\amalg}(s, e)}{\sum\{P_i^{\amalg}(s', e') \mid (s, e) \sim_i (s', e')\}}. \end{aligned}$$

  where $P_i^{\amalg}$ is defined by recursion on the inverse order of S' as follows:

$$P_i^{\amalg}(s, e) = (\sum_{\alpha\in\Phi} P_i(e) \cdot P_i^{\alpha}(s) \cdot \mathsf{pre}(e \mid \alpha)) - \sum\{P_i^{\amalg}(t, e) \mid s < t\}$$

  and

$$P_i^{\alpha}(s) = \sum\{P_i(t) \mid t \in S, s \leq t, S, t \models \alpha \text{ and } S, t \not\models \beta \text{ for all } \beta \in \Phi \text{ with } \beta \neq \alpha \text{ and } \beta \to \alpha\}$$

- the map $[\![\cdot]\!]' : \mathsf{AtProp} \to \mathcal{P}S'$ is defined as follows:
  - $[\![p]\!]' := [\![p]\!] \times E$,



Fig. 8. Updated model $\mathbb{M}^{\mathbb{E}}$

- $[\![\texttt{Apply}]\!]' := [\![\top]\!] = S'$,
- $[\![\texttt{Exhibit}]\!]' := [\![\top]\!] = S'$.

The updated model $\mathbb{M}^{(\mathbb{E},\texttt{Yes})}$ is partially given in Figure 8. Indeed, we indicate only the valuation of p, the order and the subjective probabilities for the investor i.
Since we know that the current world is one of the following $\{(s_0, e_1), (s_1, e_1), (s_2, e_1)\}$, we can only consider the corresponding equivalent class. Indeed, the set $\{(s_0, e_1), (s_1, e_1), (s_2, e_1)\}$ is an equivalence class for the three equivalence relations $\sim_a$, $\sim_i$ and $\sim_g$. By doing so, we obtain the model given by Figure 9.



Fig. 9. Submodel model of $\mathbb{M}^{\mathbb{E}}$

7.4 Interpretation

Using insight from [BHP13] we present an interpretation of the informal reasoning of the investor, his understanding of the situation and how these change following the event that takes place. Indeed, let us assume that the investor's understanding of probabilities is not continuous but rather coarse (see also [Mul02]). In particular, the investor is not interested in the exact probabilities and does not distinguish all possible scenarios, but rather the language he uses to reason about probabilities partitions the unit interval into discrete categories, shown in Figure 10.

Probability	Category
$[0, 0.01)$	Impossible
$[0.01, 0.1]$	Implausible
$(0.1, 0.5]$	Unlikely
$(0.5, 0.7]$	Likely
$(0.7, 0.9)$	Very likely
$[0.9, 0.99]$	Almost certain
$[0.99, 1]$	Certain

Fig. 10. Investor's interpretation of probabilities

Hence the original model is interpreted by the agent as shown in Figure 11. In particular the investor considers it implausible to be able to say that the investment is a bad one, and unlikely to be able to say that it is a good one. Rather it seems more likely that it is still unclear whether the artist a will be a profitable investment.



Fig. 11. Submodel model of $\mathbb{M}^{\mathbb{E}}$

After the exhibition of a at g, the interpretation of the situation by the investor changes quite drastically, as seen in Figure 12. Indeed, now it seems likely that the artist will be a good investment and impossible that investing on the artist will not be profitable. Furthermore, the investor considers it unlikely that there is still no good indication regarding the projection of the worthiness of the artist.



Fig. 12. Submodel model of $\mathbb{M}^{\mathbb{E}}$

8 Conclusions and further directions

Proof theory for probabilistic logics. As mentioned in the introduction, the present paper pertains to a line of research aimed at studying the phenomenon of dynamic (probabilistic epistemic) updates in contexts at odds with classical truth. The language and semantics of the formal settings previously studied (i.e. those of the nonclassical versions of PAL and EAK) have served as a basis for a research program in structural proof theory aimed at developing a uniform methodology for endowing dynamic logics with so-called *analytic calculi* (cf. [CR16,GMP$^+$04]). This research program has successfully addressed PAL and DEL [GKP13,FGK$^+$14b,FGK$^+$14a,FGK$^+$14c], and PDL [FGKP14], and has been further generalized into the proof-theoretic framework of *multi-type calculi* [FGK$^+$14b]. This methodology has been successfully deployed to introduce analytic calculi for logics particularly impervious to the standard treatment [FGPY36,GPa,GPb,BGP$^+$], and is now ready to be applied to the issue of endowing PDEL and its non-classical versions with analytic calculi.

Relational semantics for IPDEL. As mentioned earlier, Esakia duality for Heyting algebras [Esa74] and Bezhanishvili's duality for monadic Heyting algebras [Bez99] can serve as a basis for the definition of a relational semantics for IPDEL. Developing this semantics requires an extensive

duality-theoretic treatment of probability measures and probability distributions in the intuitionistic setting, analogous to the one developed in [FGM16], which is currently work in progress.

References

Ach14. A. C. Achimescu. Games and logics for informational cascades. Master's thesis, University of Amsterdam, 2014.

AGM08. Stefano Aguzzoli, Brunella Gerla, and Vincenzo Marra. De Finetti's no-dutch-book criterion for Gödel logic. *Studia Logica*, 90(1):25–41, 2008.

AP14. S. Artemov and T. Protopopescu. Intuitionistic epistemic logic. *preprint arXiv:1406.1582*, 2014.

BCHS13. A. Baltag, Z. Christoff, J. U. Hansen, and S. Smets. Logical models of informational cascades. *Studies in Logic. College Publications*, 2013.

Bez98. Guram Bezhanishvili. Varieties of monadic heyting algebras. part i. *Studia Logica*, 61(3):367–402, 1998.

Bez99. Guram Bezhanishvili. Varieties of monadic heyting algebras part ii: Duality theory. *Studia Logica*, 62(1):21–48, 1999.

BGP$^+$. Marta Bilkova, Giuseppe Greco, Alessandra Palmigiano, Apostolos Tzimoulis, and Nachoem Wijnberg. The logic of resources and capabilities. *Submitted. ArXiv preprint 1608.02222.*

BHP13. Adam Bjorndahl, Joseph Y Halpern, and Rafael Pass. Language-based games. *Proceedings of Fourteenth Conference on Theoretical Aspects of Rationality and Knowledge*, pages 39–48, 2013.

BMS99. Alexandru Baltag, Lawrence S. Moss, and Slawomir Solecki. The logic of public announcements, common knowledge and private suspicious. Technical Report SEN-R9922, CWI, Amsterdam, 1999.

BR15a. Z. Bakhtiari and U. Rivieccio. Epistemic updates on bilattices. submitted, 2015.

BR15b. Zeinab Bakhtiarinoodeh and Umberto Rivieccio. Epistemic updates on bilattices. In *Logic, Rationality, and Interaction*, pages 426–428. Springer, 2015.

BvDF16. Zeinab Bakhtiari, Hans van Ditmarsch, and Sabine Frittella. Algebraic semantic of refinement modal logic. In Lev Beklemishev, Stéphane Demri, and András Máté, editors, *Advances in Modal Logic*, volume 11. College Publications, 2016.

CFPT. Willem Conradie, Sabine Frittella, Alessandra Palmigiano, and Apostolos Tzimoulis. Relational semantics of intuitionistic probabilistic dynamic epistemic logic. in preparation.

CFPT15. Willem Conradie, Sabine Frittella, Alessandra Palmigiano, and Apostolos Tzimoulis. Probabilistic epistemic updates on algebras. In *Logic, Rationality, and Interaction*, pages 64–76. Springer, 2015.

CP12. W. Conradie and A. Palmigiano. Algorithmic correspondence and canonicity for distributive modal logic. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 163(3):338 – 376, 2012.

CPZ. Willem Conradie, Alessandra Palmigiano, and Zhiguang Zhao. Sahlqvist via translation. Submitted. ArXiv preprint 1603.08220.

CR16. Agata Ciabattoni and Revantha Ramanayake. Power and limits of structural display rules. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic*, 17(3):17:1–17:39, 2016.

CRR16. Leonardo Cabrer, Umberto Rivieccio, and Ricardo Oscar Rodriguez. Łukasiewicz public announcement logic. In *International Conference on Information Processing and Management of Uncertainty in Knowledge-Based Systems*, pages 108–122. Springer, 2016.

DP02. B. A. Davey and H. A. Priestley. *Lattices and Order*. Cambridge Univerity Press, 2002.

Esa74. L. Esakia. Topological Kripke models. *Soviet Math. Dokl.*, 15:147 – 151, 1974.

FGK$^+$14a. S. Frittella, G. Greco, A. Kurz, A. Palmigiano, and V. Sikimić. A multi-type display calculus for dynamic epistemic logic. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, Special Issue on Substructural Logic and Information Dynamics, 2014.

FGK$^+$14b. S. Frittella, G. Greco, A. Kurz, A. Palmigiano, and V. Sikimić. Multi-type sequent calculi. In Michal Zawidzki Andrzej Indrzejczak, Janusz Kaczmarek, editor, *Trends in Logic XIII*, pages 81–93. Lodź University Press, 2014.

FGK$^+$14c. S. Frittella, G. Greco, A. Kurz, A. Palmigiano, and V. Sikimić. A proof-theoretic semantic analysis of dynamic epistemic logic. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, Special Issue on Substructural Logic and Information Dynamics, 2014.

FGKP14. S. Frittella, G. Greco, A. Kurz, and A. Palmigiano. Multi-type display calculus for propositional dynamic logic. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, Special Issue on Substructural Logic and Information Dynamics, 2014.

FGM16. Tommaso Flaminio, Brunella Gerla, and Francesco Marigo. States of finite gbl-algebras with monoidal sum. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 2016.

FGPY36. Sabine Frittella, Giuseppe Greco, Alessandra Palmigiano, and Fan Yang. A multi-type calculus for inquisitive logic. In Jouko Väänänen, Åsa Hirvonen, and Ruy de Queiroz, editors, *Logic, Language, Information, and Computation: 23rd International Workshop, WoLLIC 2016, Puebla, Mexico, August 16-19th, 2016. Proceedings*, LNCS 9803, pages 215–233. Springer, 2016. ArXiv preprint 1604.00936.

FHM90. Ronald Fagin, Joseph Y Halpern, and Nimrod Megiddo. A logic for reasoning about probabilities. *Information and computation*, 87(1):78–128, 1990.

FS$^+$78. Gisèle Fischer-Servi et al. The finite model property for *mipq* and some consequences. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, 19(4):687–692, 1978.

GKP13. G. Greco, A. Kurz, and A. Palmigiano. Dynamic epistemic logic displayed. In Huaxin Huang, Davide Grossi, and Olivier Roy, editors, *Proceedings of the 4th International Workshop on Logic, Rationality and Interaction (LORI-4)*, volume 8196 of *LNCS*, 2013.

GMP$^+$04. Giuseppe Greco, Minghui Ma, Alessandra Palmigiano, Apostolos Tzimoulis, and Zhiguang Zhao. Unified correspondence as a proof-theoretic tool. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 2016. doi: 10.1093/logcom/exw022. ArXiv preprint 1603.08204.

GPa. Giuseppe Greco and Alessandra Palmigiano. Lattice logic properly displayed. *In preparation.*

GPb. Giuseppe Greco and Alessandra Palmigiano. Linear logic properly displayed. *Submitted. ArXiv preprint 1611.04181.*

Koo03. B. P. Kooi. Probabilistic dynamic epistemic logic. *Journal of Logic, Language and Information*, 12(4):381–408, 2003.

KP13. A. Kurz and A. Palmigiano. Epistemic updates on algebras. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 2013. abs/1307.0417.

Lan13. S. Lang. *Linear Algebra*. Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer New York, 2013.

Mac37. Holbrook Mann MacNeille. Partially ordered sets. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 42(3):416–460, 1937.

MPS14. M. Ma, A. Palmigiano, and M. Sadrzadeh. Algebraic semantics and model completeness for intuitionistic public announcement logic. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 165(4):963–995, 2014.

Mul02. Sendhil Mullainathan. Thinking through categories. *Unpublished manuscript, available at www.haas.berkeley.edu/groups/finance/cat3.pdf*, 2002.

Riv14. U. Rivieccio. Algebraic semantics for bilattice public announcement logic. *Studia Logica, Proc. Trends in Logic XIII, Springer*, 2014.

VB11. Johan Van Benthem. *Logical dynamics of information and interaction.* Cambridge University Press, 2011.

vBGK09. J. van Benthem, J. Gerbrandy, and B. P. Kooi. Dynamic update with probabilities. *Studia Logica*, 93(1):67–96, 2009.

vBvEK06. Johan van Benthem, Jan van Eijck, and Barteld P. Kooi. Logics of communication and change. *Information and Computation*, 204(11):1620–1662, 2006.

Wea03. B. Weatherson. From classical to intuitionistic probability. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, 44(2):111–123, 2003.

A Soundness of the reduction axioms

In this section we aim at proving the soundness of the reduction axioms as stated in Lemma 11. To do so we need to define two maps F and f as follows.

A.1 Preliminary results.

Given the complex algebra $\mathbb{A}$ of a model $\mathcal{M}$ and an event $\mathbb{E}$, we define a map $F : \mathcal{L} \to \mathbb{A}^{\Pi}$ that associates to each formula an element in $\mathbb{A}^{\Pi}$. We want F (Definition 28) to be the map such that

$$[\![\psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{E}}} = [F(\psi)].$$

$[\![\psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{E}}}$ is the evaluation of the formula ψ in the updated algebra $\mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{E}}$ corresponding to the updated model $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{E}}$. Hence, $F(\psi)$ is a representative of the equivalence class $[\![\psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{E}}}$ in the product algebra $\mathbb{A}^{\Pi}$.
Since $F(\psi) \in \mathbb{A}^{\Pi}$, $F(\psi)$ is a tuple of elements of the algebra $\mathbb{A}$. To help us in the computation we define the map $f : \mathcal{L} \times E \to \mathcal{L}$ (see definition 27) such that $F(\psi)(e) = [\![f(\psi, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}$. This means that $f(\psi, e)$ is a formula such that its evaluation $[\![f(\psi, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}$ in the algebra $\mathbb{A}$ is equal to the e^{th} coordinate of the tuple $F(\psi)$.

We first prove that the maps F and f have the desired properties in Lemma 18. Then we prove the key lemma 19 that we will use to prove the reduction axioms (see Section A.2).

Definition 27. *For every $\psi \in \mathcal{L}$ and $e \in E$ let us define by recursion the formula $f(\psi, e)$:*

$$
\begin{aligned}
f(p,e) &= \mathbf{sub}(e,p)\\
f(\bot,e) &= \bot\\
f(\top,e) &= \top\\
f(\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2,e) &= f(\psi_1,e) \wedge f(\psi_2,e)\\
f(\psi_1 \vee \psi_2,e) &= f(\psi_1,e) \vee f(\psi_2,e)\\
f(\psi_1 \to \psi_2,e) &= f(\psi_1,e) \to f(\psi_2,e)\\
f(\Diamond_i\psi,e) &= \bigvee_{e' \sim_i e} \Diamond_i(f(\psi,e') \wedge \mathsf{pre}(e'))\\
f(\Box_i\psi,e) &= \bigwedge_{e' \sim_i e} \Box_i(\mathsf{pre}(e') \to f(\psi,e'))\\
f(\langle \mathbb{E}', e'\rangle\psi,e) &= f(\mathsf{pre}(e') \wedge f(\psi,e'),e)\\
f([\mathbb{E}', e']\,\psi,e) &= f(\mathsf{pre}(e') \to f(\psi,e'),e)\\
f(\alpha\mu_i(\psi) \geq \beta,e) &= \alpha \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i e\\ \phi \in \Phi}} \mu_i^{\phi}(f(\psi,e')) \cdot P_i(e') \cdot \mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi) + \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i e\\ \phi \in \Phi}} -\beta\mu_i^{\phi}(\top)P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi) \geq 0
\end{aligned}
$$

Definition 28. *For event model $\mathbb{E} = (E, ...)$, let us define the map $F_{\mathbb{E}} : \mathcal{L} \to \mathbb{A}^{\Pi}$ such that for every $e \in E$, the e^{th} coordinate of $F_{\mathbb{E}}(\psi)$ is equal to $[\![f(\psi, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}$.*
For the sake readability, we will omit the subscript when it causes no confusion.

Lemma 18. *For every $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathbb{E}$,*

$$[\![\psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{E}}} = [F(\psi)]$$

where $F(\psi)(e) = [\![f(\psi, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Proof. By induction on ψ. Trivially true in the base cases and if the main connective belongs to $\{\wedge, \vee, \to\}$. If $\psi = \Diamond_i\psi'$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
[\![\Diamond_i\psi']\!]_{\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{E}}} &= \Diamond^{\mathbb{E}}[\![\psi']\!]_{\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{E}}}\\
&= \Diamond_i^{\mathbb{E}}[F(\psi')] && \text{(induction hypothesis)}\\
&= [\Diamond_i^{\Pi}(F(\psi') \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}})]
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Diamond_i^{\Pi}(F(\psi') \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}})(e) &= \bigvee_{e' \sim_i e} \{\Diamond_i(F(\psi')(e') \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}(e'))\} && \text{(definition)}\\
&= \bigvee_{e' \sim_i e} \{\Diamond_i([\![f(\psi', e')]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}(e'))\}\\
&= [\![\bigvee_{e' \sim_i e} \Diamond_i(f(\psi', e') \wedge \mathsf{pre}(e'))]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}\\
&= [\![f(\Diamond_i\psi', e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Definition 27)}\\
&= F(\Diamond_i\psi')(e)
\end{aligned}
$$

If $\psi = \Box_i\psi'$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
[\![\Box_i\psi']\!]_{\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{E}}} &= \Box_i^{\mathbb{E}}[\![\psi']\!]_{\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{E}}}\\
&= \Box_i^{\mathbb{E}}[F(\psi')] && \text{(induction hypothesis)}\\
&= [\Box_i^{\Pi}(\overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}} \to F(\psi'))]
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\Box_i^{\prod}(\overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}} \to F(\psi'))(e) &= \bigwedge_{e' \sim_i e} \{\Box_i(\overline{\mathsf{pre}}(e') \to F(\psi')(e'))\} && \text{(definition)}\\
&= \bigwedge_{e' \sim_i e} \{\Box_i(\overline{\mathsf{pre}}(e') \to [\![f(\psi', e')]\!]_{\mathcal{M}})\}\\
&= [\![\bigwedge_{e' \sim_i e} \Box_i(\mathsf{pre}(e') \to f(\psi', e'))]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}\\
&= [\![f(\Box_i \psi', e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Definition 27)}\\
&= F(\Box_i \psi')(e)
\end{aligned}$$

If $\psi = \alpha\mu_i(\psi') \geq \beta$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
&[\![\alpha\mu_i(\psi') \geq \beta]\!]_{\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{E}}}\\
&= \bigvee\{[f_{e,a}] \mid \alpha\mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}([\![\psi']\!]_{\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{E}}} \wedge [f_{e,a}]) \geq \beta\}\\
&= \bigvee\{[f_{e,a}] \mid \alpha\mu_i^{\mathbb{E}}(F(\psi')] \wedge [f_{e,a}]) \geq \beta\} && \text{(induction hypothesis)}\\
&= \bigvee\{[f_{e,a}] \mid \alpha\frac{\mu_i'(F(\psi') \wedge f_{e,a})}{\mu_i'(f_{e,a})} \geq \beta\} && \text{(definition)}\\
&= \left[\bigvee\{f_{e,a} \mid \alpha\frac{\mu_i'(F(\psi') \wedge f_{e,a})}{\mu_i'(f_{e,a})} \geq \beta\}\right]\\
&= \left[\bigvee\{f_{e,a} \mid \alpha\mu_i'(F(\psi') \wedge f_{e,a}) - \beta\mu_i'(f_{e,a}) \geq 0\}\right]\\
&= \left[\bigvee\{f_{e,a} \mid \alpha \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i e\\ \phi \in \Phi}} \mu_i^{\phi}(F(\psi')(e') \wedge a) \cdot P_i(e') \cdot \mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi) + \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i e\\ \phi \in \Phi}} -\beta\mu_i^{\phi}(a) \cdot P_i(e') \cdot \mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi) \geq 0\}\right]
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bigvee\{f_{e,a} \mid \alpha \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i e\\ \phi \in \Phi}} \mu_i^{\phi}(F(\psi')(e') \wedge a)P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi) + \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i e\\ \phi \in \Phi}} -\beta\mu_i^{\phi}(a)P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi) \geq 0\}(d)\\
&= \bigvee\{f_{e,a} \mid \alpha \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i e\\ \phi \in \Phi}} \mu_i^{\phi}([\![f(\psi', e')]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \wedge a)P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi) + \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i e\\ \phi \in \Phi}} -\beta\mu_i^{\phi}(a)P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi) \geq 0\}(d)\\
&= \bigvee\{a \mid \alpha \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i d\\ \phi \in \Phi}} \mu_i^{\phi}([\![f(\psi', e')]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \wedge a)P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi) + \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i d\\ \phi \in \Phi}} -\beta\mu_i^{\phi}(a)P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi) \geq 0\}\\
&= [\![\alpha \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i d\\ \phi \in \Phi}} \mu_i^{\phi}(f(\psi', e'))P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi) + \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i d\\ \phi \in \Phi}} -\beta\mu_i^{\phi}(\top)P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi) \geq 0]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}\\
&= [\![f(\alpha\mu_i(\psi') \geq \beta, d)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Definition 27)}\\
&= F(\alpha\mu_i(\psi') \geq \beta)(d).
\end{aligned}$$

If $\psi = \langle \mathbb{E}', e' \rangle \psi'$ and $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{E}}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}
[\![\langle \mathbb{E}', e' \rangle \psi']\!]_{\mathcal{N}} &= [\![\mathsf{pre}(e')]\!]_{\mathcal{N}} \wedge \pi_{e'} \circ i'([\![\psi']\!]_{\mathcal{N}^{\mathbb{E}'}})\\
&= [\![\mathsf{pre}(e')]\!]_{\mathcal{N}} \wedge \pi_{e'} \circ i'([F(\psi')]) && \text{(induction hypothesis)}\\
&= [\![\mathsf{pre}(e')]\!]_{\mathcal{N}} \wedge \pi_{e'}(F(\psi') \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}})\\
&= [\![\mathsf{pre}(e')]\!]_{\mathcal{N}} \wedge F(\psi')(e') \wedge [\![\mathsf{pre}(e')]\!]_{\mathcal{N}}\\
&= [\![\mathsf{pre}(e')]\!]_{\mathcal{N}} \wedge [\![f(\psi', e')]\!]_{\mathcal{N}} \wedge [\![\mathsf{pre}(e')]\!]_{\mathcal{N}}\\
&= [\![\mathsf{pre}(e')]\!]_{\mathcal{N}} \wedge [\![f(\psi', e')]\!]_{\mathcal{N}}\\
&= [\![\mathsf{pre}(e') \wedge f(\psi', e')]\!]_{\mathcal{N}}\\
&= [F(\mathsf{pre}(e') \wedge f(\psi', e'))] && \text{(induction hypothesis)}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} F(\mathsf{pre}(e') \wedge f(\psi', e'))(e) &= [\![f(\overline{\mathsf{pre}}(e') \wedge f(\psi', e'), e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \\ &= [\![f(\langle \mathbb{E}', e' \rangle \psi', e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Definition 27)} \\ &= F(\langle \mathbb{E}', e' \rangle \psi')(e). \end{aligned}$$

Finally if $\psi = [\mathbb{E}', e']\, \psi'$ and $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{E}}$ then

$$\begin{aligned} [\![[\mathbb{E}', e']\, \psi']\!]_{\mathcal{N}} &= [\![\mathsf{pre}(e')]\!]_{\mathcal{N}} \to \pi_{e'} \circ i'([\![\psi']\!]_{\mathcal{N}^{\mathbb{E}'}}) \\ &= [\![\mathsf{pre}(e')]\!]_{\mathcal{N}} \to \pi_{e'} \circ i'([F(\psi')]) && \text{(induction hypothesis)} \\ &= [\![\mathsf{pre}(e')]\!]_{\mathcal{N}} \to \pi_{e'}(F(\psi') \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}) \\ &= [\![\mathsf{pre}(e')]\!]_{\mathcal{N}} \to F(\psi')(e') \wedge [\![\mathsf{pre}(e')]\!]_{\mathcal{N}} \\ &= [\![\mathsf{pre}(e')]\!]_{\mathcal{N}} \to [\![f(\psi', e')]\!]_{\mathcal{N}} \wedge [\![\mathsf{pre}(e')]\!]_{\mathcal{N}} \\ &= [\![\mathsf{pre}(e')]\!]_{\mathcal{N}} \to [\![f(\psi', e')]\!]_{\mathcal{N}} && (a \to (a \wedge b) = a \to b) \\ &= [\![\mathsf{pre}(e') \to f(\psi', e')]\!]_{\mathcal{N}} \\ &= [F(\mathsf{pre}(e') \to f(\psi', e'))] && \text{(induction hypothesis)} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} F(\mathsf{pre}(e') \to f(\psi', e'))(e) &= [\![f(\overline{\mathsf{pre}}(e') \to f(\psi', e'), e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \\ &= [\![f([\mathbb{E}', e']\, \psi', e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Definition 27)} \\ &= F([\mathbb{E}', e']\, \psi')(e). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 19. *For every $\mathcal{M}$, $\mathbb{E}$, e and ψ,*

$$[\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e \rangle \psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} = \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![f(\psi, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \qquad \textit{and} \qquad [\![[\mathbb{E}, e]\, \psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} = \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![f(\psi, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}.$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} [\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e \rangle \psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= [\![\overline{\mathsf{pre}}(e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \wedge \pi_e \circ i'([\![\psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{E}}}) \\ &= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge \pi_e \circ i'([F(\psi)]) && \text{(Lemma 18)} \\ &= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge \pi_e(F(\psi) \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}) \\ &= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge F(\psi)(e) \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \\ &= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![f(\psi, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} [\![[\mathbb{E}, e]\, \psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= [\![\overline{\mathsf{pre}}(e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \to \pi_e \circ i'([\![\psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{E}}}) \\ &= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to \pi_e \circ i'([F(\psi)]) && \text{(Lemma 18)} \\ &= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to \pi_e(F(\psi) \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}) \\ &= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to F(\psi)(e) \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \\ &= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![f(\psi, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \\ &= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![f(\psi, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}. && (a \to (a \wedge b) = a \to b) \end{aligned}$$

A.2 Proof of the soundness.

Axiom I1. $[\mathbb{E}, e]\, p = \mathsf{pre}(e) \to \mathbf{sub}(e, p)$.

$$\begin{aligned} [\![[\mathbb{E}, e]\, p]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![f(p, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Lemma 19)} \\ &= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![\mathbf{sub}(e, p)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}. \end{aligned}$$

Axiom I2. $\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle p = \mathsf{pre}(e) \wedge \mathbf{sub}(e, p)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
[\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle p]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![f(p, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Lemma 19)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![\mathbf{sub}(e, p)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Axiom I3. $[\mathbb{E}, e]\,\top = \top$.

$$\begin{aligned}
[\![[\mathbb{E}, e]\,\top]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![f(\top, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Lemma 19)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![\top]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}\\
&= [\![\top]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Axiom I4. $\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle \top = \mathsf{pre}(e)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
[\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle \top]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![f(\top, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Lemma 19)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![\top]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e).
\end{aligned}$$

Axiom I5. $[\mathbb{E}, e]\,\bot = \neg\mathsf{pre}(e)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
[\![[\mathbb{E}, e]\,\bot]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![f(\bot, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Lemma 19)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![\bot]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}\\
&= [\![\neg\mathsf{pre}(e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Axiom I6. $\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle \bot = \bot$.

$$\begin{aligned}
[\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle \bot]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![f(\bot, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Lemma 19)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![\bot]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}\\
&= \bot.
\end{aligned}$$

Axiom I7. $[\mathbb{E}, e]\,(\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2) = [\mathbb{E}, e]\,\psi_1 \wedge [\mathbb{E}, e]\,\psi_2$.

$$\begin{aligned}
[\![[\mathbb{E}, e]\,(\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![f(\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Lemma 19)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![f(\psi_1, e) \wedge f(\psi_2, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Definition 27)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![f(\psi_1, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \wedge [\![f(\psi_2, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}\\
&= (\overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![f(\psi_1, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}) \wedge (\overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![f(\psi_2, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}})\\
& && (a \to b \wedge c = (a \to b) \wedge (a \to c))\\
&= [\![[\mathbb{E}, e]\,\psi_1]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \wedge [\![[\mathbb{E}, e]\,\psi_2]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Lemma 19)}
\end{aligned}$$

Axiom I8. $\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle(\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2) = \langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle\psi_1 \wedge \langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle\psi_2$.

$$\begin{aligned}
[\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle(\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![f(\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Lemma 19)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![f(\psi_1, e) \wedge f(\psi_2, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Definition 27)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![f(\psi_1, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![f(\psi_2, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}\\
&= [\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle\psi_1]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \wedge [\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle\psi_2]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Lemma 19)}
\end{aligned}$$

Axiom I9. $[\mathbb{E}, e]\,(\psi_1 \vee \psi_2) = \mathsf{pre}(e) \to \langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle\psi_1 \vee \langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle\psi_2$.

$$\begin{aligned}
[\![[\mathbb{E}, e]\,(\psi_1 \vee \psi_2)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![f(\psi_1 \vee \psi_2, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Lemma 19)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![f(\psi_1, e) \vee f(\psi_2, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Definition 27)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge ([\![f(\psi_1, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \vee [\![f(\psi_2, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}) && (a \to b = a \to a \wedge b)\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to (\overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}} \wedge [\![f(\psi_1, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}) \vee (\overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![f(\psi_2, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}})\\
& && \text{(distributivity)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle\psi_1]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \vee [\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle\psi_2]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Lemma 19)}
\end{aligned}$$

Axiom I10. $\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle(\psi_1 \vee \psi_2) = \langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle\psi_1 \vee \langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle\psi_2$.

$$\begin{aligned}
[\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle(\psi_1 \vee \psi_2)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![f(\psi_1 \vee \psi_2, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Lemma 19)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![f(\psi_1, e) \vee f(\psi_2, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Definition 27)}\\
&= (\overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![f(\psi_1, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}) \vee (\overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![f(\psi_2, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}) && \text{(distributivity)}\\
&= [\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle\psi_1]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \vee [\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle\psi_2]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Lemma 19)}
\end{aligned}$$

Axiom I11. $[\mathbb{E}, e]\,(\psi_1 \to \psi_2) = \langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle\psi_1 \to \langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle\psi_2$.

$$\begin{aligned}
[\![[\mathbb{E}, e]\,(\psi_1 \to \psi_2)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![f(\psi_1 \to \psi_2, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Lemma 19)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![f(\psi_1, e) \to f(\psi_2, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Definition 27)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to ([\![f(\psi_1, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \to [\![f(\psi_2, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}})\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![f(\psi_1, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \to [\![f(\psi_2, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && (a \to (b \to c) = a \wedge b \to c)\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![f(\psi_1, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \to \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![f(\psi_1, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \wedge [\![f(\psi_2, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}\\
& && (b \to c = b \to b \wedge c))\\
&= [\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle\psi_1]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \to [\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle\psi_1]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \wedge [\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle\psi_2]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Lemma 19)}\\
&= [\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle\psi_1]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \to [\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle\psi_2]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}. && (b \to c = b \to b \wedge c))
\end{aligned}$$

Axiom I12. $\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle(\psi_1 \to \psi_2) = \mathsf{pre}(e) \wedge (\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle\psi_1 \to \langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle\psi_2)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
[\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle(\psi_1 \to \psi_2)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![f(\psi_1 \to \psi_2, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Lemma 19)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![f(\psi_1, e) \to f(\psi_2, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Definition 27)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge ([\![f(\psi_1, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \to [\![f(\psi_2, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}})\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge (\overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![f(\psi_1, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \to [\![f(\psi_2, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}})\\
& && (a \wedge (b \to c) = a \wedge (a \wedge b \to c))\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge (\overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![f(\psi_1, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \to [\![f(\psi_2, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![f(\psi_1, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}})\\
& && (b \to c = b \to b \wedge c))\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge ([\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle\psi_1]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \to [\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle\psi_1]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \wedge [\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle\psi_2]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}) && \text{(Lemma 19)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge ([\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle\psi_1]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \to [\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle\psi_2]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}). && (b \to c = b \to b \wedge c))
\end{aligned}$$

Axiom I13 $[\mathbb{E}, e]\,\Diamond_i\psi = \mathsf{pre}(e) \to \bigvee_{e' \sim_i e} \Diamond_i(\langle \mathbb{E}, e'\rangle\psi)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
[\![[\mathbb{E}, e]\,\Diamond_i\psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![f(\Diamond_i\psi, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Lemma 19)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![\bigvee_{e' \sim_i e} \Diamond_i(f(\psi, e') \wedge \mathsf{pre}(e'))]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Definition 27)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to \bigvee_{e' \sim_i e} \Diamond_i([\![f(\psi, e')]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e'))\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to \bigvee_{e' \sim_i e} \Diamond_i([\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e'\rangle\psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}) && \text{(Lemma 19)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![\bigvee_{e' \sim_i e} \Diamond_i(\langle \mathbb{E}, e'\rangle\psi)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Axiom I14. $\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle \Diamond_i \psi = \mathsf{pre}(e) \wedge \bigvee_{e' \sim_i e} \Diamond_i (\langle \mathbb{E}, e'\rangle \psi)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
[\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle \Diamond_i \psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![f(\Diamond_i \psi, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Lemma 19)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![\bigvee_{e' \sim_i e} \Diamond_i (f(\psi, e') \wedge \mathsf{pre}(e'))]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Definition 27)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge \bigvee_{e' \sim_i e} \Diamond_i ([\![f(\psi, e')]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e'))\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge \bigvee_{e' \sim_i e} \Diamond_i ([\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e'\rangle \psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}) && \text{(Lemma 19)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![\bigvee_{e' \sim_i e} \Diamond_i (\langle \mathbb{E}, e'\rangle \psi)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Axiom I15. $[\mathbb{E}, e]\, \Box_i \psi = \mathsf{pre}(e) \to \bigwedge_{e' \sim_i e} \Box_i ([\mathbb{E}, e']\psi)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
[\![[\mathbb{E}, e]\, \Box_i \psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![f(\Box_i \psi, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Lemma 19)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![\bigwedge_{e' \sim_i e} \Box_i (\mathsf{pre}(e') \to f(\psi, e'))]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Definition 27)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to \bigwedge_{e' \sim_i e} \Box_i (\overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e') \to [\![f(\psi, e')]\!]_{\mathcal{M}})\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to \bigwedge_{e' \sim_i e} \Box_i ([\![[\mathbb{E}, e']\, \psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}) && \text{(Lemma 19)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![\bigwedge_{e' \sim_i e} \Box_i ([\mathbb{E}, e']\, \psi)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Axiom I16. $\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle \Box_i \psi = \mathsf{pre}(e) \wedge \bigwedge_{e' \sim_i e} \Box_i ([\mathbb{E}, e']\psi)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
[\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle \Box_i \psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} &= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![f(\Box_i \psi, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Lemma 19)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![\bigwedge_{e' \sim_i e} \Box_i (\mathsf{pre}(e') \to f(\psi, e'))]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Definition 27)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge \bigwedge_{e' \sim_i e} \Box_i (\overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e') \to [\![f(\psi, e')]\!]_{\mathcal{M}})\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge \bigwedge_{e' \sim_i e} \Box_i ([\![[\mathbb{E}, e']\, \psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}) && \text{(Lemma 19)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![\bigwedge_{e' \sim_i e} \Box_i ([\mathbb{E}, e']\, \psi)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Axiom I17. $[\mathbb{E}, e]\,(\alpha\mu_i(\psi) \geq \beta) = \mathsf{pre}(e) \to \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i e \\ \phi \in \Phi}} \alpha P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi)\mu_i^\phi([\mathbb{E}, e']\,\psi) + \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i e \\ \phi \in \Phi}} -\beta P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi)\mu_i^\phi(\top) \geq 0$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&[\![[\mathbb{E}, e]\,(\alpha\mu_i(\psi) \geq \beta)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} = \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![f(\alpha\mu_i(\psi) \geq \beta, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![\alpha \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i e \\ \phi \in \Phi}} \mu_i^\phi(f(\psi, e'))P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi) - \beta \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i e \\ \phi \in \Phi}} \mu_i^\phi(\top)P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi) \geq 0]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Definition 27)} \\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to \bigvee \left\{ a \mid \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i e \\ \phi \in \Phi}} \alpha P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi)\mu_i^\phi([\![f(\psi, e')]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \wedge a) + \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i e \\ \phi \in \Phi}} -\beta P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi)\mu_i^\phi(a) \geq 0 \right\} \\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to \bigvee \left\{ a \mid \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i e \\ \phi \in \Phi}} \alpha P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi)\mu_i^\phi([\![f(\psi, e')]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e') \wedge a) + \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i e \\ \phi \in \Phi}} -\beta P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi)\mu_i^\phi(a) \geq 0 \right\} \\
&\qquad\qquad ([\![\varphi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \leq \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e') \text{ if } \mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \varphi) \neq 0, \text{ cf. Proposition 5}) \\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to \bigvee \left\{ a \mid \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i e \\ \phi \in \Phi}} \alpha P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi)\mu_i^\phi((\overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e') \to [\![f(\psi, e')]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}) \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e') \wedge a) + \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i e \\ \phi \in \Phi}} -\beta P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi)\mu_i^\phi(a) \geq 0 \right\} \quad (a \wedge (a \to b) = a \wedge b) \\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to \bigvee \left\{ a \mid \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i e \\ \phi \in \Phi}} \alpha P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi)\mu_i^\phi([\![[\mathbb{E}, e']\,\psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e') \wedge a) + \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i e \\ \phi \in \Phi}} -\beta P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi)\mu_i^\phi(a) \geq 0 \right\} && \text{(Lemma 19)} \\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to \bigvee \left\{ a \mid \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i e \\ \phi \in \Phi}} \alpha P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi)\mu_i^\phi([\![[\mathbb{E}, e']\,\psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \wedge a) + \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i e \\ \phi \in \Phi}} -\beta P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi)\mu_i^\phi(a) \geq 0 \right\} && ([\![\varphi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \leq \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e') \text{ if } \mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \varphi) \neq 0) \\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \to [\![\sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i e \\ \phi \in \Phi}} \alpha P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi)\mu_i^\phi([\mathbb{E}, e']\,\psi) + \sum_{\substack{e' \sim_i e \\ \phi \in \Phi}} -\beta P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi)\mu_i^\phi(\top) \geq 0]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Axiom I18. $\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle(\alpha\mu_i(\psi) \geq \beta) = \mathsf{pre}(e) \wedge \sum_{\substack{e'\sim_i e\\ \phi\in\Phi}} \alpha P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi)\mu_i^\phi(\langle \mathbb{E}, e'\rangle\psi) + \sum_{\substack{e'\sim_i e\\ \phi\in\Phi}} -\beta P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi)\mu_i^\phi(\top) \geq 0$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&[\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e\rangle(\alpha\mu_i(\psi) \geq \beta)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![f(\alpha\mu_i(\psi) \geq \beta, e)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![\alpha \sum_{\substack{e'\sim_i e\\ \phi\in\Phi}} \mu_i^\phi(f(\psi, e'))P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi) - \beta \sum_{\substack{e'\sim_i e\\ \phi\in\Phi}} \mu_i^\phi(\top)P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi) \geq 0]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} && \text{(Definition 27)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge \bigvee \left\{ a \mid \sum_{\substack{e'\sim_i e\\ \phi\in\Phi}} \alpha P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi)\mu_i^\phi([\![f(\psi, e')]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \wedge a) + \sum_{\substack{e'\sim_i e\\ \phi\in\Phi}} -\beta P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi)\mu_i^\phi(a) \geq 0 \right\}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge \bigvee \left\{ a \mid \sum_{\substack{e'\sim_i e\\ \phi\in\Phi}} \alpha P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi)\mu_i^\phi([\![f(\psi, e')]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \wedge \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e') \wedge a) + \sum_{\substack{e'\sim_i e\\ \phi\in\Phi}} -\beta P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi)\mu_i^\phi(a) \geq 0 \right\}\\
&\qquad\qquad ([\![\varphi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \leq \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e') \text{ if } \mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \varphi) \neq 0, \text{ cf. Proposition 5})\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge \bigvee \left\{ a \mid \sum_{\substack{e'\sim_i e\\ \phi\in\Phi}} \alpha P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi)\mu_i^\phi([\![\langle \mathbb{E}, e'\rangle\psi]\!]_{\mathcal{M}} \wedge a) + \sum_{\substack{e'\sim_i e\\ \phi\in\Phi}} -\beta P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi)\mu_i^\phi(a) \geq 0 \right\} && \text{(Lemma 19)}\\
&= \overline{\mathsf{pre}}_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \wedge [\![\sum_{\substack{e'\sim_i e\\ \phi\in\Phi}} \alpha P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi)\mu_i^\phi(\langle \mathbb{E}, e'\rangle\psi) + \sum_{\substack{e'\sim_i e\\ \phi\in\Phi}} -\beta P_i(e')\mathsf{pre}(e' \mid \phi)\mu_i^\phi(\top) \geq 0]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}
\end{aligned}
$$